DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 519 CE 064 466

AUTHOR	Geale, John; Duke, Chris
TITLE	Good Practice in University Continuing Vocational Education. UCACE Occasional Paper No. 13.
INSTITUTION	Universities Council for Adult and Continuing Education, Leicester (England).
PUB DATE	Dec 92
NOTE	134p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Vocational Education; *Continuing Education; Department Heads; Educational Change; *Educational Practices; *Educational Strategies; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Program Administration; *Vocational Directors
IDENTIFIERS	*United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

A project was conducted to identify good practice in continuing vocational education (CVE) and the barriers to increasing the quantity and quality of CVE provided by universities in the United Kingdom. During the project, 6 research briefing seminars were attended by 46 persons, 13 researchers conducted case studies, 17 researchers conducted key issue investigations, and 21 universities participated in visits/seminars conducted by the project manager. The study found that all UK universities are committed to providing more CVE, tending toward more integration with degree teaching and research. Good practices identified for senior management include the following: staff motivation, effective financial systems, financial incentives, accreditation of CVE, and recognition for teaching. For CVE directors, these good practices were recommended: departmental coordination and information sharing, good links with central administration, coordinated external networking, and change management. Good practices for department heads were as follows: making CVE a normal academic duty and being selective about collaborators. (Eight appendixes provide the following: an extended project description; a project outline and methodology; lists of steering committee members, case studies, key issues, a list of related projects, and statistical data on CVE in 1990-91 and 1991-92.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 361 519

UCACE OCCASIONAL PAPER NO.13

UNIVERSITIES COUNCIL FOR ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

GOOD PRACTICE IN UNIVERSITY CONTINUING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION – FROM TACTICS TO STRATEGY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DECEMBER 1992

CE 060 477

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Good Practice in University Continuing Vocational Education

Written by John Geale

with

Chris Duke

The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those expressed by all the contributors to the project, those of the Universities Council for Adult and Continuing Education, or those of the Government.

CONTENTS

		Page
1.	Executive Summary	1
2.	Introduction:	9
3.	Background to CVE in Universities	12
	3.1 Organisational objectives	13
	3.2 Academic staff	15
	3.3 Types of provision and markets	15
	3.4 Traditional organisational structures .	17
	3.5 Development funding	20
	3.6 Current change	21
4.	Integration, Sustainability and Quality	23
5.	Good practice for senior management	28
	5.1 Planning and monitoring	28
	5.2 Organisational structures	30
	5.3 Buildings	33
	5.4 Financial encouragement and control	35
	5.5 External relations	39
	5.6 Teaching	40
	5.7 Personnel	42
	5.8 Allocation of development funding	43
6.	Good practice for CVE directors	47
	6.1 Planning and monitoring	48
	6.2 Financial, administrative and marketing support	49

6.3 Support through R and D 51
6.4 Supporting teaching 53
6.5 Relationships with central administration 54
6.6 External networking 55
6.7 Managing change 58

7. Good practice for heads of departments 61
7.1 Departmental planning 61
7.2 Self-financing units 63
7.3 Secure markets 65
7.4 Staff selection, development and motivation 68
7.5 Strategies for success 69

8. Wider outcomes 71
8.1 Professional networking 71
8.2 CE monitoring 72
8.3 CE funding 72

Appendices:

1. Extended project description
2. Steering Committee membership
3. Project outline and methodololgy
4. List of case studies
5. List of key issues
6. List of, related, UFC-funded projects
7. UCACE membership
8. Letter from Celia Jones concerning TECs and HE
9. CER Data on CVE, 1991-92
10. Form 3 Data on CVE, 1990-91

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following key points are taken from the text of the report, where they are emboldened. For further clarification, please refer to the page reference.

		Full report page number
Background		
1.	All 'old' UK universities are now committed, in their institutional plans to the UFC, to providing more continuing vocational education (CVE) than ever before.	12
2.	There are no preferred arrangements appropriate to all universities, or even to all departments within the same university.	12
3.	Lack of clarity about institutional objectives, and of real commitment to them, are the most important obstacles to more, and better, CVE.	13
4.	The need for clearly stated and widely understood strategic objectives is universal.	13
5.	Revenue generation is rarely the primary objective of CVE, but is normally a necessary condition for its sustainability.	13
6.	CVE does not need to detract from research and undergraduate teaching.	13

		Full report page number
7.	The newer and more diverse activities in higher education will only gain respectability in the 'old' (UFC) universities if the academic staff involved gain recognition and reward.	15
8.	Management training is now the largest single area of CVE and technology is still under-represented. There is a growing demand for training which combines technology and management.	16
9.	Most universities do not serve a single, coherent CVE market common to all subject departments.	16
10.	Both individuals and their employers are customers of CVE.	17
11.	Universities are highly decentralised institutions, being federations of semi-autonomous departments. The special expertise of 'extra-mural' departments can be valuable, but their historically peripheral position may inhibit their contribution to the development of institution-wide CVE.	18–19
12.	Many of the five strategic institutional objectives (social concern, promotion, employer contacts, staff development and public relations) can best be realised through strong involvement, if not ownership, by the subject departments.	20
13.	A requirement for central CVE units to be self-financing can limit their wider-ranging institutional role.	20

Integration, Sustainability and Quality

14. Higher education institutions will need to make adjustments to their academic structures, to their pedagogic methods and to the system by which they deliver their courses in order to accommodate this new balance between initial and continuing education. An integrated model for CVE delivery (in which responsibility for CVE programmes is devolved to subject departments) is increasingly being adopted and some universities are near to achieving it. 23

15. The change preferred by most universities is towards more integration between CVE, degree teaching and research with devolved responsibility to subject departments. 24

16. Devolution to and integration with subject departments increases the need for a strong central unit to provide professional expertise, planning and monitoring – including quality assurance and control. This may also include some central delivery of CVE which is multi-disciplinary, or innovative. 25

17. Long-term sustainability depends on the contributions made by CVE to the five strategic aims of the university. For many universities this involves the integration of CVE into departmental planning. 27

Good Practice for Senior Management		Full report page number
18.	A key to success is staff motivation, requiring both leadership from very senior management and skilled management by heads of departments.	28
19.	A more strategic approach is likely to include fewer ad hoc short courses and more focused and structured programmes, some of which may well be award-bearing.	28
20.	There is still too little belief that CVE will continue to be an important part of the portfolio of a successful university.	30
21.	Half of the responding universities felt that lack of accommodation was seriously limiting their CVE provision – despite a similar proportion now having purpose-designed CVE facilities.	34–35
22.	Effective financial systems should be a priority. The way in which they are operated is critical.	36
23.	The average fee income is currently too low for independent sustainability, though the range of fees is extremely wide. Much of the work at the top end is profitable.	38
24.	Financial incentives are being used universally to encourage more CVE. These are primarily to departments, though there are also strong traditions of individual payments in cash or in kind.	38

		Full report page number
25.	The further banding together of university services concerned with either internal development or external networking would be helpful.	39
26.	One of the most important issues to surface during the project was the accreditation of CVE provision.	40
27.	More recognition is needed for CVE teaching, which requires not only scholarship but also expert knowledge of the market, and of learning methods.	42
28.	Universities should not become over dependent on earmarked CVE development funding. Where such funding exists it should be allocated, and monitored, against strategic plans.	45

Good Practice for CVE Directors

29.	The planning and monitoring of CVE, and the role of CVE directors in this, has been greatly strengthened by the UFC 'portfolio' funding of CE. However, some CVE units have responsibility without corresponding authority, or control over CVE delivery.	48
30.	Delivering subject departments should be free to develop their own plans, but such plans should be quantified and should be known to the CVE unit.	48

		Full report page number
31.	There is considerable emphasis on guarding against the financial failure of CVE activities, often without corresponding support to ensure success in terms of marketing, learning outcomes (quality) and staff development.	50–51
32.	The use in some universities of departmental CVE co-ordinators and of internal CE newsheets has proved to be helpful.	52–53
33.	Only when subject departments mind sufficiently about the successful outcomes of their CVE programmes do they make full use of the expertise of CVE professionals.	53
34.	Traditional divisions and tensions between academic and administrative functions, and between CE and subject departments, are unhelpful. Good links with central administration seem to be particularly important.	55
35.	There is great attraction in providing well co-ordinated external networking and internal links with other 'commercial' services.	56
36.	Nine recommendations emerged on 'managing change'. There are increasing opportunities for CVE initiatives to contribute to more general academic development, throughout the institution, in response to new opportunities and demands.	59

Good Practice for Heads of Departments

		Full report page number
37.	FTE student numbers on CVE programmes are unlikely to exceed 10% of FSNs unless additional academic appointments are made.	63
38.	Much CVE is delivered through designated units, or centres, which combine short courses, consultancy and research.	64–65
39.	High quality CVE involves considerable investment which requires a secure market if it is to be sustained, and therefore justified.	65
40.	CVE must increasingly become a normal academic duty reflected in employment contracts, appraisals and promotions. There should be proportionately less reliance on financial incentives to individuals.	67
41.	CVE does offer substantial opportunities, particularly for younger staff, to achieve both career and personal goals through recognition by practitioners of their subject.	68
42.	In terms of client groups, modes of delivery and collaborative partners, departments will need to be selective in who they work with, looking for long–term relationships with the prospect of strategic benefits.	69

Wider Outcomes

		Full report page number
43.	The project was an experiment in professional networking and proved to be extremely productive and rewarding. UCACE is becoming an effective network for this and there is now an urgent need to include, for mutual benefit, the new universities.	71
44.	The project has indicated considerable confusion in the use, and interpretation of the current monitoring records in use in the 'old' universities. Changes in the records themselves are not expected before 1994/95.	72
45.	University commitment to CVE is real, but fragile. Earmarked grants from the Funding Council have been the most potent influence for positive change.	73

2. INTRODUCTION

The project developed from one of the regular meetings between the Department of Education and Science (DES) now the Department for Education (DFE) and the Universities Council for Adult and Continuing Education (UCACE). The Department suggested that UCACE was best placed to identify good practice in continuing vocational education (CVE) and the barriers to successfully increasing the quantity and quality of CVE provided by the universities. The Department agreed to fund a project which would be undertaken by, and for, the UCACE membership. Amongst other things it would:

* be directed at the 'old' universities; i.e. institutions coming under the Universities Funding Council (UFC)

* examine issues related to the implementation of universities' CVE policies

* investigate, in particular, the integration of CVE within the institution

An explicit aim was to design the project to 'maximise its utility and dissemination through the structures, membership and network of UCACE'. The implicit objective was to further improve this network by extending participation in UCACE to more CVE practitioners and by providing more professional support. The **process** was, therefore, of equal importance to the outcomes, or **products**.

The work was not intended to be representative of all aspects of good practice – only of some practical issues on which the UCACE members felt, **at that time**, that the exchange of information would be helpful. There were, in April 1991, already many changes in university funding and management, but the project preceded the abolition of the binary line and the creation of the new Higher Education Funding Councils.

Good practice is, by definition, forward looking. It should anticipate and be capable of responding to change. The project itself was about managing change. The findings should not, therefore, be unduly affected by the new legislation. The project would however have been planned differently if it had been formulated in 1992 and not in 1990. It would, for instance, have emphasised the National Education and Training Targets, the Training and Enterprise Councils (TECs) and the role of continuing education (CE) in the higher education strategy of the European Community (EC). These and many other important issues are under-represented in, or even excluded from, this report.

An extended description of the project, as originally agreed with the DES, is given in **appendix 1**. An outline of the methodology is reported in **appendix 3** and lists of the case studies and key issue reports are given in **appendices 4** and **5**.

The project was managed by John Geale under the direction of the UCACE Secretary, Professor Chris Duke, and a Steering Committee (**appendix 2**).

Time, information and creative energy were given by many colleagues with the generosity and care of enthusiasts pioneering a new deal in higher education. The nature of this deal is explored in what follows. It is more about people than profit. Despite this, learners receive scant mention, while a lot is said about funding and earned income.

The contributory case study and key issue papers identify the universities which contributed. This report does not; but it does acknowledge with gratitude their contributions, and apologises for the many omissions. There were, inevitably, important findings which do not appear in this final 'product'. The process, however, was experienced as often lively, rich and rewarding. It will be for others to evaluate it.

Chapter 3 and the five which follow it are based on the material of the thirty authors who contributed directly to the project. Their papers overlapped because it was not possible to isolate the issues. Where there was particularly strong agreement, **the key points are emboldened in the text**. These points are summarised in **chapter 1**.

Quotations are used to illustrate the text and are shown in *italics*. Some sources are identified, but those taken from the field work of the project are not, as it was agreed not to identify the participants, or their institutions, in this report.

The Executive Summary of this report is also published separately. It puts the key points of the first chapter into context and is intended for all those to whom the report is addressed, but for whom CVE is not their primary responsibility. This full report is principally for CVE practitioners. They may wish to use it, selectively, to inform the debate on CVE good practice in their own institution.

3. BACKGROUND TO CVE IN UNIVERSITIES

All UK universities are now committed, in their institutional plans to the UFC, to providing more CVE than ever before. These commitments exist on paper, but are not always reflected in practice. Many of the barriers to the successful implementation of CVE arise from the traditions, culture and current situation of the 'old' universities. Some of these are referred to in the following six sections of this chapter.

Contrasting with the widespread agreement on many key issues was also amazing variety. Each university was unique. Even within a single university, it was rarely possible to make generalisations which were true for all departments. This caveat, that every statement may be a generalisation of a wide range of practices or policies, will not be repeated, but it applies throughout the report. The extended description of the project (**appendix 1**) stated that **there were no preferred arrangements appropriate to all universities , or even to all departments within the same university**. This chapter sets the scene and will include a few **key points**. The core **chapters** are **5**, **6** and **7** which refer to good practice for CVE in three separate areas of responsibility:

* Senior management (eg. VC, PVCs, Registrars, Finance Officers)

* CVE directors (and their colleagues)

* Heads of departments (and their academic colleagues)

This division is explained further in section **3.4**, where generalisations are made about the organisational responsibilities of 'CVE units'. This label, and the responsibilities associated with it, are schematic for the purpose of this report and do not necessarily reflect current, or good, practice. A key issue on, say, 'marketing' typically contained points for managers in all three areas and references to it are, therefore, made in a number of chapters.

3.1 Organisational objectives

Despite all the differences between institutions, and between departments delivering CVE, there was consistent agreement between all the contributors and across all universities that **lack of clarity about institutional objectives, and of real commitment to them, were the most important obstacles to more, and better, CVE.**

> *A major reason for the perceived lack of commitment to CVE is that universities have not really clarified what their purposes are with respect to CVE and this has left practitioners feeling disoriented.*
>
> *It is necessary to understand the implications for all areas of policy and practice, and to ensure consistency in these, if support for CVE is to go beyond tokenism.*
>
> *As a generalisation, universities are not clear of their precise objectives for CVE. At present it appears to fall between having educational and financial objectives.*

The detail of good practice in one institution may not apply in another, but **the need for clearly stated and widely understood strategic objectives was universal**. Two misconceptions need to be cleared away.

* **Revenue generation was rarely the primary objective of CVE, but was normally a necessary condition for its sustainability.**

* **CVE does not need to detract from research and undergraduate teaching**. The problem was thought to be more one of departmental management than of conflict for scarce resources.

Research is, however, the activity which characterises the 'old' universities and distinguishes them from the rest of higher education. It is a crucial factor in institutional funding, departmental management and in academic staff promotion. **Its significance informed the whole of this study.**

A distinction must be made between immediate tactical objectives (eg. to balance the accounts) and longer-term strategic aims, which for CVE may include:

* **Social concern**, both by the provision of skills helpful to the economy and by providing wider access to learning for personal development.

* **Promotion** of the university's research and undergraduate teaching.

* **Employer contacts** for research, consultancy, equipment, work experience, graduate recruitment, etc.

* **Staff development** which arises from working with practitioners, innovative delivery, etc.

* **Public relations**, including public and private funding.

The above five strategic objectives have been emphasised because they were referred to by many contributors and will be mentioned again in this report. These objectives boil down to 'developing good relations'. This concern for others may be expressed in the university's charter, or in its history, or it may not be expressed at all. But 'earning surplus funds for the university is the most publicised objective and the one least likely to occur'. Understanding this seemed to be central to understanding the current position of CVE in universities.

3.2 Academic staff

Having clearly defined the university's strategic objectives in CVE and having transmitted these across the institution, the university needs to show support for these purposes and recognise their diversity. This will be more extensive than the traditional activities and include wider definitions of both 'teaching' and 'research'. **The newer and more diverse activities in higher education will only gain respectability in the 'old' (UFC) universities if the academic staff involved gain recognition and reward.**

Some were on limited contracts, some on 'academic related staff' contracts, both of which they regarded as inferior to other academic staff. Others on traditional contracts often felt that CVE fell between 'private' work, with additional payment, and 'normal duties'. Yet even those staff undertaking CVE as part of their normal work have less access to normal recognition, titular or otherwise, and normal promotion – even though this was often written into the criteria.

The background to CVE is that staff recruitment, employment and promotion do not yet reflect universities' stated commitment to CVE.

3.3 Types of provision and markets

Prior to the establishment of business schools, most of the large university providers of CVE were serving the public sector: local government, health service administration, social work, police studies, education, medicine, defence, etc. In some, central government was funding both the provider and the customer – and still is, for instance, in training resourced by the Department of Health. Fees have, in the past, tended to be low.

Historically much of the provision was linked to well-defined professional organisations. Some of the training was offered nationally (eg. health service management, environmental health, urban studies) and other was more regional (eg. social work, INSET). A further stimulus to CVE was a wish to use spare teaching and/or residential capacity, often at marginal cost, by in-filling with short courses and conferences.

Nowadays management training is the most widely sought form of CVE and technology is still under-represented. The statistics (see **page 45**) show that the social science subject group, including management, contributes 50% of all training reported to the Continuing Education Record (CER). Indeed, universities not able to offer management training, at least in combination with other disciplines, may be seriously disadvantaged. Universities are ideally placed to provide technical training, often badly neglected, and particularly **training combining technology and management**.

The following characteristics of universities' traditional markets are important if misconceptions, and inappropriate policies, are to be avoided:

* **Most universities do not serve a single, coherent CVE market common to all subject departments.** Unified marketing arrangements of the kind sometimes tried in the past, linked to the local area, and seeking to address all potential customers, have largely proved to be unsuccessful.

* Each subject department may have its own market which, for leading-edge science and technology, is likely to be national and international.

* Universities have tended to arrange most CVE with larger employing organisations and have only worked with small and medium-sized enterprises

(SMEs) where the employers were already highly organised (eg. architects, solicitors), or where their training was being 'sponsored' by a training or development agency.

Universities differed from the polytechnics in their undergraduate recruitment.

> *The polytechnics have built up community links, whereas universities have traditionally seen themselves as catering for a national market.*
>
> Tim Eggar, Minister of State for Education, 26 June 1991.

In this respect the strong part-time community programmes offered by university departments of adult continuing education bring them closer to the polytechnics. This pattern of regional provision has often extended to role education (eg. magistrates) and to some CVE, but is not the norm in vocational CE. Most CVE short courses involve full-time attendance on one or more days during the week and are likely to be paid for by their employer. But it is important to realize that both participate in the selection of courses and both commit resources (time and money), **so that both the individuals and their employers are customers of CVE.**

3.4 Traditional organisational structures

Even the most strongly led – perhaps especially the most strongly led – universities are highly devolved institutions.

> *Our softly-softly bottom-up approach continues to appear more attractive than a directive, centralist approach...*

Universities are federations of semi-autonomous subject departments whose self-dependence, though not their independence, is being increased with devolved budgets.

> *The managerial weaknesses of these self-governing institutions (ie. universities) originated during their long development as institutions which combine an absence of clear authority at the centre with the power of veto belonging to faculties and departments.*
>
> Keith Drake, 'The Recovery of University Autonomy in Great Britain', 1985.

More than half the universities in the UK have traditional extra-mural departments (EMDs), now often re-named departments of continuing or adult continuing education. **Their special expertise is needed.** There is an historic and persistent distinction between Liberal Adult Education (LAE) and Continuing Vocational Education (CVE) which is bedded deep in their cultures and administrative (and funding) arrangements. The EMDs' known 'liberal' identity within their parent university and **their somewhat separate traditions, as 'the off-licence outside the walls'**, may inhibit their contribution to the development of university-wide CVE. Some have and some have not now assumed such responsibilities.

All universities have established a central focus, described here as a 'unit', for CVE with some university-wide, 'co-ordinating' responsibilities, but these vary enormously in scope. CVE units can be primarily deliverers of programmes, like any subject department or EMD, or solely facilitators. Some are a combination of the two. The roles of policy making, co-ordinating and delivery are assumed **for the arrangement of the material in this report**, to be as follows:

	* Corporate planning	* Marketing	Finance	Human Resource Management	Delivery
Policy Making Senior Management Chapter 5	Institutional objectives Capital investment Financial systems PR Academic development	Some co-ordination through advisory committees	x Policy and administration	x Policy and administration	—
Co-ordination CVE Unit Chapter 6	Internal and external networking	Market research and sales promotion	Advice and monitoring	Liaison and staff development	Administrat-ion and support
Delivery Subject Departments Chapter 7	Marketing plan	x	x	x	x

x denotes operational responsibility

* Note 'Marketing' is not conceptually separate from 'corporate planning', but because of their over-arching importance, and the devolved nature of universities, they are shown separately.

Something between a quarter and a half (depending on how you count university colleges) of all CVE units are solely co-ordinating units and it is this function which is described in **chapter 6**. However, the majority combine co-ordination with delivery, alongside the university's subject departments. In no UK university is all

CVE delivered centrally. Some central delivery, by a CVE unit, may be needed to encourage inter-disciplinary programmes, innovative delivery methods, or to meet the needs of students who are important to the university as a whole, but who are not (yet) included in the remit of any particular subject department.

Many of the five strategic institutional objectives listed in 3.1 (social concern, promotion, employer contacts, staff development and public relations) can best be realised through strong involvement, if not ownership, by the subject departments.

Some CVE units are required to be entirely self-financing. **An over-emphasis on this may take the unit away from its institutional role to an undue concentration on its own programmes.** There was also a strong feeling that absence of any central delivery by a CVE unit could **reduce the unit's academic credibility**, and therefore its utility. These issues are discussed in **5.2**. The key points here are:

* The historical importance of the EMDs, their continuing special expertise and their place within the organisational structure.

* Universities' devolved management with strong departmental autonomy and loyalties.

3.5 Development funding

It is a tenet of government policy that CVE activity should be self-financing - certainly across a range of programmes and over time. Separate UFC-funded research is investigating what this means in practice (**appendix 6**), but the theory was found to be widely understood.

Since 1985 there have been increasing amounts of earmarked government money to develop CVE, initially from the DES and more recently from the UFC. In 1990/91 the

UFC development funding for CVE in universities was approximately £10 m. (excluding INSET) against a declared turnover of £46 m. on the Universities Statistical Record (USR) Form 3 (**appendix 10**). Development funding has, therefore, become very significant – particularly when seen against the reducing general levels elsewhere in the university system. Indeed it is doubtful whether the increase in CVE output could have occurred without it.

> *These middle managers (Heads of Department) saw general financial constraints as a major factor militating against growth in CVE.*

> *The role of CVE units, who may co-ordinate rather than manage vocational CE, is strongly linked to the management of development funding.*

In addition to the UFC funding, some development money has also been available from the Employment Department (ED), the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) and from the European Community.

3.6 Current change

Universities have been both pro-active and reactive in seeking to change, and improve, their CVE activities.

> *University administrators have pressed and pummelled their EMDs in an attempt to find a shape fitted to a new mission and function.*

Universities have been responding to new government initiatives and recognising new opportunities. They have been searching for the best ways to encourage particularly rapid change within a university system of naturally high inertia. It has already been mentioned in **chapter 2** that the project was formulated in 1990. In the two years since then there have been major changes affecting CVE, for instance:

* inclusion of CVE in institutional planning statements to the UFC in June 1990

* devolution of cost centres

* increased selectivity in the funding of research

* wider access of students

* credit accumulation and transfer schemes (CATS)

* introduction of National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs)

* modularisation of courses

These are additional to the important government and European initiatives already mentioned in **chapter 2**.

Some of these changes were highlighted in responses to the questionnaire and in the case studies described in the project outline and methodology (**appendix 3**). The sea-change in universities' attitudes to modularisation and the mushrooming of interest in award-bearing CVE are two examples. Others came too late to be included fully in the study.

The most recent government changes abolishing the binary line and creating new Higher Education Funding Councils (HEFCs) make even the present already out of date. **But none of these changes invalidates in any way the findings**. The barriers to developing CVE still exist and must be identified if they are to be overcome and good practice still followed. The changes do also create exciting new opportunities. The 'old' universities look forward to learning much from their 'new' polytechnic colleagues. Their different traditions are referred to again in **5.2** and **8.1**.

4. INTEGRATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND QUALITY

Continuing vocational education was deemed to be 'sustainable', for the purpose of this project, if it could be maintained at a given level of activity without continuous 'development' funding. This emerged as the most important single criterion of good practice, but was not specifically mentioned in the conception, or during the gestation period, of the project. 'Integration', on the other hand, is not self–evidently a characteristic of good practice and was very much emphasized in the project proposal. The link between these two characteristics is crucially important.

> *We consider that continuing education should be regarded as an integral part of the work of universities.*
>
> AUT policy statement on CE, August 1987.

This statement refers more to mission than to the structures needed for its implementation. Statements that refer to CE as 'integrated', 'mainstreamed' or 'embedded' intend to suggest centrality and permanency, but may make no specific commitment about structure.

These terms may be interchangeable in other contexts, but are used more specifically in this report. **The acceptance of CVE as an institutional objective is referred to as mainstreaming**. The above quotation is one such example. On the other hand, **integration refers to the particular organisational arrangement in which responsibility for CVE delivery is devolved to subject departments**. All models for implementing CVE as an institutional objective require institution–wide support. This applies to devolved, 'integrated', delivery and to central delivery through a specialist unit.

> ***The higher education institutions will need to make adjustments to their academic structures, to their pedagogic methods and to the system***

by which they deliver their courses in order to accommodate this new balance between initial and continuing education.

Memorandum on Higher Education from the European Community's Task Force on Human Resource Education, Training and Youth, December 1991.

More means different. More CE will mean different structures and different delivery systems and **more integration between CVE, degree teaching and research**. This implies more than the **recognition** of CE 'as equal to research and to the traditional teaching of young undergraduates' (UGC Working Party, 1984). It also implies that CVE will become **part of the responsibility of all subject departments.** Or does it really mean this? There are currently several different ways of achieving 'structural integration'.

(i) Contracting individual volunteers from subject departments to teach on CVE programmes which are organised and delivered centrally – the traditional 'extra-mural' model.

(ii) Devolving 'ownership' of CVE programmes to the subject departments, but allowing CVE to remain a separate, ad hoc activity without strategic plans to link it to either degree teaching or research.

(iii) Integration into coherent, departmental strategies.

Many universities have examples of all three and, in addition, may have centrally delivered CVE programmes which do not use departmental academics, that is, they are not structurally integrated.

There were underlying presumptions about the notion of good practice to the effect that it should be 'sustainable' on financial, political, administrative and other grounds.

A great deal of CVE is priced at little more than its marginal costs (**key issue 1**) and is not, therefore, 'sustainable' on purely financial grounds. Its purpose is primarily to further the **strategic** aims of the university. The need for these aims to be clearly specified and understood is a recurring theme of this report. One such aim concerns **quality**. CVE involves close collaboration with practitioners and the use of 'new pedagogic methods'. It provides opportunities for staff development. It is also increasingly attracting accreditation. The mutual benefits of integrating long and short courses became increasingly evident throughout the project. So what is the case for at least part of the CVE programme to be delivered centrally?

The function of continuing education staff should be to collaborate and interact with other education establishments, with employers, professional institutions, trade unions, voluntary bodies and local government. They should undertake research into matters common to all CE, such as needs and provision, staff development, teaching techniques and methods and materials appropriate to all adult learning. Staff should apply their research and use their external contacts to identify demand and either to channel that demand to the appropriate subject department, or to promote courses themselves, ***particularly where a multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary approach is required.***

UGC Continuing Education Working Party, January 1984.

The division of most universities into subject departments can be unhelpful in meeting the learning needs of employed people. Their requirements may be central to the

university's overall mission, but marginal to each of its constituent subject departments when taken separately.

Similarly a university may, collectively, wish to invest in new teaching and learning technology without the burden falling unduly on particular subject departments. Many examples were given of universities in which distance and open learning were being pioneered by, or for, CVE, but in which the development would become an integral part of the university's strategy for both long and short courses. The central development of part-time degrees and of CATS, subsequently to be integrated across the university, are further examples of institution-wide development initiated via CVE.

Other reasons for having some central delivery of CVE, owned by the central unit, concern the unit's own need for academic credibility and **its own role in promoting good practice and quality**. It is not desirable, therefore, to equate 100 % 'integration' with good practice if this implies that all responsibility for CVE programmes should be devolved in all circumstances to the subject departments. **This devolved 'integrated model' is however increasingly being adopted**. Some of the strongest CVE providers are near to achieving it, but this does not mean it is the right route for all to follow immediately.

Too much emphasis on either the central delivery of CVE or on the requirement for the CVE unit to be self-financing can seriously detract from the unit's institution-wide responsibilities. There is professional **expertise**, as well as professional **contacts**, in CVE which cannot be assumed to exist in every department. The priority in central CVE units should be to develop and disseminate both.

> *Quality often starts with knowing the learner - not with knowing the subject.*

High quality CVE is often best sustained where departments have identified niche markets. These may be defined by subject area, method of delivery or student group/employment sector. They may well involve combinations of all three and they are not easily developed. One of the weakest aspects of the management of CVE seemed to be its **planning and monitoring**. This had often been quite good in relation to UFC funded development **projects**, yet their programmes had proved to be unsustainable without continuing development funding. Universities are only slowly developing the management systems needed to plan and monitor CVE as part of a **portfolio** of activities determined centrally, yet delivered departmentally. The move from 'projects' to 'portfolios' is reflected in the UFC's current procedures for funding CVE development, but is even more fundamental.

This report is sub-titled 'from tactics to strategy'. The most frequently reported strategy which emerged was for more devolved responsibility for CVE delivery: not because this offers short-term savings, rather because it offers long-term gains. **Quality and sustainibility may thus be achieved through 'integration', but only if the CVE programmes provide the benefits students and employers really want, and support, the five strategic aims** listed in **section 3.1** and referred to again in **chapter 5**.

5. GOOD PRACTICE FOR SENIOR MANAGEMENT

The roles associated with 'senior management' in this study are to determine policy, create the conditions necessary for its implementation and monitor progress. Two of the necessary conditions concern **organisational** and **financial** issues and these are covered in two of the sections in this chapter. A third – **motivation** – which is also the most important, is not.

> ***If the university is to realize its objectives, then much depends upon the attitudes of individual members of staff.*** *Ultimately success will depend upon central commitment, matched by that of the wider academic community.*
>
> Susan O'Brien, University of Bradford, 1989 in a paper to a CVCP seminar on 'The Entrepreneurial and Adaptive University'.

Staff motivation is discussed in **section 7.4**, within the context of **departmental management**. Senior management must give the right **leadership** to departments. Academic leadership, with related curriculum and staff development, is crucial. Indeed, issues such as quality, integration, modularisation and accreditation are referred to throughout this report and cannot be the sole responsibility of any one group. A good example of this shared responsibility is planning and monitoring, which must be a concern of senior managers, CE directors and departmental heads .

5.1 Planning and monitoring

A more strategic approach is likely to include fewer ad hoc short courses and more focussed and structured programmes, some of which may well be award-bearing.

The selective funding of CVE by successive funding councils since 1987 has gone some way to making it 'mainstream' by making it **part of institutional planning**. This has been extremely important, yet most contributors to the project were still critical that CVE did not have enough central recognition.

Are Universities really committed to CVE?
Rhetoric is unimpressive if unaccompanied by visible change.

The study showed that the **institutional commitment was real, but fragile**, relying on small numbers of enthusiastic senior managers and dedicated practitioners.

The difficulties seemed to start with the lack of clarity on the real, strategic, purpose of CVE (five objectives have already been mentioned in **3.1**) and in universities' failure to communicate this to their members. Also, their declared commitment was not always apparent in the changes to buildings, employment conditions, staff development and organisational structures which might realistically be needed for their implementation. Contributors who had not read their own institutional plan were often unaware of the strength of their university's commitment to CVE. The way in which these plans had been prepared provided an insight into the planning of CVE.

The statements made by universities to the UFC in 1990 normally contained less hard CVE information, **which had been supplied and accepted by each subject department**, than they did for full-time student members (FSNs). Many universities reported to key issue investigators that they had consulted on CVE plans, but they also recognised that few subject departments knew what full-time equivalent (FTE) student numbers, or revenue targets, the plan had committed them to achieving. The majority of universities were relying on creating an environment in which CVE would flourish, but were not directing departments in what, or how much, CVE they should do. This contrasts with the planning and monitoring of FSNs.

The increasing reliance on formalised strategic plans has created greater opportunities to encourage CVE targets at faculty and departmental level.

The lack of faculty and departmental target setting was also reflected in CVE monitoring, which is the subject of another of the UFC-funded projects (**appendix 5**). CVE monitoring was frequently seen as a 'central' activity which was 'peripheral' to most departments, though this was not always the case (**6.1**). Institutionally, **there seemed to be too little confidence that a strong CVE profile was going to be important to their success** and this uncertainty about the pay-off was reflected in departments.

5.2 Organisational structures

Most of the study's key issues focused on 'problems', but respondents to the initial questionnaire did not see a problem here. Indirectly, however, the replies told us about marginality and lack of clout which are to do with lack of 'mainstreaming'.

Whatever model was used to deliver CVE, there were normally central arrangements for policy formation and review by means of executive and advisory committees, or groups. The need for clarity and commitment at this senior level has already been stressed. **It needs to be open and obvious throughout the university**.

The internal organisation of CVE must be judged and managed with an eye to universities' current history and evolution. Nowhere is it a fixed situation. There is no single prescription for an effectively integrated CVE operation. Yet the gains from getting it right are considerable. Many of the concerns of CE specialists, such as access and flexible learning, are now centre stage.

All British universities now have some kind of distinct central unit (department, centre or office) with some university-wide responsibilities for CVE. Its role will normally

be to co-ordinate and facilitate and may extend to providing administrative services. It may also run its own CVE programmes. The aims and objectives of CVE units are part 'commercial' and part 'educational' and, depending on the particular university, can relate to many different internal offices. It may share with them any of a great array of different activities. Some are concerned with **external relations (5.5)** and others with **internal developments (5.6)**. These links and shared responsibilities can be shown, diagrammatically, as a matrix.

Matrix of external relations and internal development

	CVE	Industrial Liaison	Careers Service	Subject Departments	Development Office	Educational Development	Enterprise in HE	Staff Development	European Liaison	Modularisation/CATS	Information/PR/Publications	Admissions	Conference Office
Continuing Professional Development (CPD/CVE)	x	?	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Technology Needs Assessment	x	x		x									
Training Needs Analysis	x	x	x	x									
Contract Research		x		x					x				
Licensing/IPR		x											
Work Experience	x	x	x	x			x		x				
Graduate Recruitment			x	x									
Equipment		x		x	x								
Studentships	x	x	x	x	x				x			x	
International Links	x	x	x	x					x	x		x	x
Staff Development	x			x		x	x	x		x			
Access	x			x			x	x		x			
PR	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x
New Educational Technology	x			x		x	x	x	x				
Fund Raising			x		x				x				

Acknowledgement: From an unpublished paper by Dr Christopher Padfield, University of Cambridge

Some CVE units have a very 'commercial' feel and could sensibly sit alongside, say, the Industrial Liaison Office (ILO), thus providing a very desirable single interface between the institution and industry. This pattern is more common in the polytechnics than in the 'old' universities, which have tended to link it more with 'internal development', with central administration, or with an existing EMD. The location of the CVE unit both reflects and determines its role.

Too little emphasis seems to have been given, very often, to the **relationship with the central administration**. It is as if 'academic credibility', together with an 'entrepreneurial spirit', were incompatible with a close relationship. Good relationships are developed by the physical location and by shared (or seconded) appointments, as well as by the organisational structure. There is no obvious way to divide a seamless robe and there are a few universities that have separate CVE units for delivery (often linked to LAE) and for the university-wide co-ordination. But the norm is a single CVE unit responsible for co-ordination and any central delivery.

Advisory and administrative services offered by CVE units are described in **6.2**. These are most likely to involve finance, planning and monitoring. Less common, though equally important, is marketing and the least frequent are staff and curriculum development and the use of new technology for distance, or flexible, learning. Where assistance with course administration is also offered, this is paid for in many different ways. CVE units could operate on a service charge, top-slicing or profit - and risk-sharing basis (with differential stress on the relationship between the CVE unit and the department). **But the financial basis of the CVE unit is fundamental**. The effect of requiring it to be self-financing has already been mentioned in **3.4** and is referred to again in **chapter 6**. An over-emphasis on the requirement to be self-financing may also give wrong messages regarding senior management's strategic objectives for CVE.

Different roles for the CVE unit, and different levels of service, seem to be needed at different times in an institution's, or in a department's, development of their CVE work. Introducing (additional) charges to departments for these services once their

programmes are established seems to be an effective way of maintaining a balance between encouragement and control. Many established CVE providers operate through self-financing units (**section 7.2**).

Self-financing units, centres or institutes may be within a subject department, separate but within the academic faculty structure, or outside both. Their utility is that they may more easily have accommodation, staff and other facilities tailored to their CVE function. They also have good external visibility and enjoy strong collaborative links with their market, or even with other training providers. This may be an aid to marketing (**7.3**) as much as it is to internal organisation.

Arrangements for CVE must derive from and be congruent with a university's strategic plan, all of which have now become more explicit. They must also be congruent with a university's culture and style.

> *CVE arrangements that affront 'the way we do things here' will find the road a slow and rocky one.*

Some universities are relying on external forces to press their departments into undertaking CVE. The study's contributors were convinced that more was needed and drew attention to the **process of CVE**, as well as to the institutional arrangements relating to it. This identified key activities, such as the linking of CVE development funding to outcomes, rather than to proposals. However the questions were asked, many of the same answers emerged: better monitoring, more accredited CVE and closer integration with research and degree teaching.

5.3 Buildings

Purpose-built, or adapted, buildings for CVE were thought to be quite as important in determining the **quality** , as the **quantity** of short course provision. A very wide range of both teaching and residential facilities are used but the availability of specialist

facilities is most critical in the expanding, and competitive, areas of training for industry and commerce, particularly for management training.

> *The opening of our new residential training facility has transformed our relationships with employers.*

The extent to which universities have invested in buildings in order to implement their institutional plans for CVE was investigated. Replies were received from over half UK universities. 70% had purpose-built, or purpose-adapted, accommodation for CVE, half with residential facilities. **Half of the responding universities felt that lack of accommodation was seriously limiting their CVE provision** and this included some which already had purpose-built facilities. It looked as if universities with purpose-built accommodation (which probably indicated their market position) were also signalling on-going problems in keeping pace with demand. It was interesting that those universities with the best facilities were anticipating the greatest growth in CVE activities. Good teaching space had usually been the first priority and represented the greatest initial investment, though there are as many universities now rating residential needs as being likely to limit the development of 'more and better CVE' as there are nominating teaching facilities.

Vocational short course are increasingly requiring not just more, but **different facilities** for their training, which is becoming more intensive, costly and demanding. The concentration of training into fewer days away from work is a consequence of employers becoming more aware of the opportunity costs. For students to be able to learn effectively throughout a long day the rooms should be well shaped, flat, comfortable, quiet and well ventilated. Unlike other students, CVE participants may well expect reception areas and secure cloakrooms, and be able to be in touch with their offices. Such clients may well be reluctant to waste time searching for car parking, or inaccessible rooms for meals and breaks. These demands cannot be met, at marginal costs, by in-filling normal student accommodation.

40% of the universities surveyed had plans to expand their CVE courses a great deal, in the near future. Of these, only one had neither purpose-designed accommodation, nor plans to create any. A significant number of universities had further capital investment plans and these were to be financed in many different ways, often involving special deals with developers or with potential clients. These plans will result in **nearly half the universities in this large sample having prime-use, purpose-built teaching and residential accommodation for CVE on, or near, campus**. Two variable factors affecting investment decisions were the use of hotels and the growth of in-company courses.

> *A determined department will not let a scarcity of appropriate accommodation on campus stop it.*

How determined departments will continue to be to overcome the discouragement of inadequate facilities remains an unanswered question, though there was anecdotal evidence that high quality facilities were a powerful motivator. What sort of facilities to build, and how to finance them, were two of the most difficult questions for senior management, who had often lacked confidence to invest risk capital in CVE. This caution was demonstrated by the plethora of very short-term employment contracts. Some universities had found ways of sharing, if not eliminating, the risks of capital investment in buildings. Many CVE practitioners felt that continued failure to improve their inadequate facilities would jeopardise their universities' plans for CVE.

5.4 Financial encouragement and control

Financial administration, including central overheads, was rated by respondents to the initial questionnaire as the issue **most impeding progress**. The study showed that this was due more to the **way** in which the systems were being operated than to the **level** of central overheads - contentious though these were.

There were often different views even within the same university on the purpose of

CVE and, particularly, on the importance of generating a financial surplus. **Profit was rarely the primary objective**, though it was normally a necessary **condition for sustainability**. The rationale for CVE needs to be understood by the people responsible for its financial management.

> *It was a great pleasure to visit those universities in which there was strong mutual respect between central financial administrators, CVE professionals and departmental academics.*

Most universities had discrete account numbers for every short course, seminar or conference which would be included on the Continuing Education Record (CER). Their internal regulations normally adopted the same categories and definitions of CE as those used by the Universities Statistical Record (USR) and/or UFC, though there was considerable uncertainty about these (ref. appendix 5, UFC-funded project on monitoring). The accounts were invariably held in the finance office, whose systems were likely to emphasise cost control and the collection of central overheads. CVE units were likely to be more concerned with pricing, market share and long-term sustainability. The units, especially those which were not in academic departments, benefitted from having a university-wide financial role – though 'policing' financial regulations was usually best left to the finance office.

The role of CVE professionals was more to do with financial 'management' than with financial 'administration'. It often concerned pricing, from a knowledge of the market, and budgetting, from a knowledge of likely costs. Heavy-handed bureaucracy was unlikely to work, though some **system of budget and fee approval was advantageous**, provided it was flexibly applied and experienced CVE practitioners were exempted (from unnecessary bureaucracy). Less experienced providers benefitted from published **guidelines which combined regulations with advice**. Help with financial 'management' in this way was the preferred role for CVE units, though some were concentrating more on the management of UFC funding for CVE course

development. **The manner in which financial regulations were administered was often more important than the regulations themselves.**

> *If the policy objectives were clear, the regulations fair and flexible and the financial administration efficient, this could contribute more to the acceptability of the control than the level of financial encouragement.*

Overheads were problematic and in a significant number of universities were being waived. **The most successful universities were able to retain the highest level of central overhead**. It did not follow that improved financial administration would, by itself, improve performance – unless it was part of a **coherent and comprehensive policy, with strong leadership and the appropriate infra-structure**. Many universities are making changes to their financial regulations for CVE and there is a strong movement towards top-slicing fee income (by between 10% and 20%) because this is unambiguous. Such universities are seeking to have easily understood, simple regulations which still leave some room for flexibility – exercised by people who understand the internal and external circumstances. Differential overheads are sometimes used for different markets (eg. voluntary sector), or for different internal resources (eg. favouring the use of university catering, or university accommodation used out of term-time).

Some of the case studies showed that the total 'price' to a participant was a stronger determinant of demand than merely the fee element. This was particularly true in distance learning. They showed that the full 'opportunity costs' to providers were also important and were rarely included in CVE budgets. So were CVE fees typically too low? The returns to the USR in 1990/91 on **Form 3** and the CER show an average fee income of £9.30 per participant hour, or approximately £60 per participant day. (Other studies show the range to be from below £20 to over £200 per participant day). The USR data gives an average fee income of either £2,790 or £3,340 per FTE, depending on whether the multiplier used is 300 or 360 hours per FTE. This equates, very approximately, with the UFC 'guide prices' for students on long courses in the

social sciences, which are likely to be far less costly to provide. **This suggests that the average short course fee income is below the level required for independent sustainability** (see also **chapter 4**). It also reflects the traditional markets served by universities described in **section 3.3**.

Few universities had their financial (**Form 3**) and student registration (CER) information on the same data-base and could not easily, therefore, monitor performance by means of indicators such as fee income/participant hour, or departmental surplus/course hour. Indeed, few performance indicators were in use.

> *In one institution the setting of individual performance targets had galvanised staff with a staggering effect on the level of performance.*

Financial incentives for CVE are being used in all the universities studied and usually fit well into the new departmental cost centres, in that the trend is to **pay surpluses to the department**. Heads of department are required to manage rewards to their own staff, though their room for discretion is often constrained by a tradition of making individual payments. These can be in cash or kind and there are substantial advantages in **encouraging staff to accept work-related expenses** for books, equipment, travel, etc. in lieu of a fee. A subsidiary advantage is that this makes the differences between staff who receive extra payment, and those who do not, less marked. Staff on special contracts, in CVE units, or in self-financing units in which CVE is part of the normal work, do not receive additional payment. But for the majority of university academics CVE is still seen, and paid, as an 'extra'.

Clarification of the financial administration of CVE is linked to each university's regulations on private work. These should help to determine two things: which courses are 'owned' by the university and how much of the teaching is part of the academics' normal duties. Many universities are apparently giving these regulations a spring clean. The balance between financial control and encouragement should be determined by senior management who, it is felt, should be prepared to invest time and

energy in getting it right. Poorly administered, or inappropriate, financial systems are damaging and should be an **early priority in any drive to expand CVE provision**.

5.5 External relations

> *The senior CE officer should not be entirely independent of other PR/marketing aims of the HEI [...] I tend to favour a combined External Development activity in which all those central offices promoting the institution in research, consultancy and CVE work together.*
>
> Professor David Johns, UCACE Annual Conference, June 1991.

The above, typically forthright, statement by the UCACE Chairman expresses a view which was shared, but less strongly, in many of the universities studied – the only reservations being those expressed in **5.2**. The links with other **commercial services** are, in some universities, less important than more general **external relations** (including careers, European liaison, admissions, conference office, alumni relations, information and PR), or links involving **internal development** (such as staff development, EHE, educational development, part–time degrees, modularisation, access and CATS). But the importance of **high visibility, good external networking and easy accessibility** is universally agreed. They all require the sort of support from senior management already referred to for CVE.

Many of the external networking and internal development activities are new and outside the traditional expertise of subject departments. They have to be both responsive to the outside and able to implement change internally. **Some banding, if not bonding, of these services together was thought to be essential for both effectiveness and for mutual support.** So how can shared concerns for **external relations** best be arranged?

A distinction needs to be made between external collaboration which is university-wide and that which is specific to selected subject departments – the latter being discussed in **6.6** and **7.3**. A number of examples were given of university-wide 'consortia', planned from the top, which had failed to take root. Universities operate in many different markets, local, national and international, both specialist and non-specialist. The plea for a 'single interface between the institution and industry' was common, but tended to come from the smaller, or more homogeneous, universities, colleges or faculties. But the difficulty of co-ordinating all departments in larger, or more disparate, institutions should not prevent senior management from ensuring that:

* primary responsibility for specified external links is clearly allocated

* cognate offices work together, with co-ordinated lines of responsibility

* the university's services are designed for the convenience of its users and all groups of customers (actual and potential) are recognised and 'cared for' throughout the university

* PR is not treated as a bolt-on extra, but designed into the whole structure of academic departments and specialised services

5.6 Teaching

One of the most topical, and important, issues to surface during this project in both the case studies and key issue investigations was the accreditation of CVE provision. It fits in well with other major initiatives such as modularisation, but is not dependent upon them. It can also help to inform, and benefit from, the current debate on **quality** – 'what are the intended learning outcomes and how do we measure them?' Why has the interest in accreditation developed now, if it is not because modularisation and CATS are providing the means?

* more professions are becoming graduate and more individuals want to upgrade their qualifications

* employers are becoming more aware of the benefits, to themselves, of accreditation

* increased professionalism: existing professions are promoting post-registration training and new professions are seeking recognition through qualification

* encouragement from the UK government and from Europe for more accredited training, some of it work-based

* changes in human resource development (HRD) with more emphasis on planned personal development. Personal goals are sometimes linked to qualifications.

Senior managers will not be surprised that some of the most important issues arising in the project were, firstly, concerned with teaching and, secondly, laid at their door! Their lead is critical on issues concerning quality, staff development and for the portfolio of initiatives leading to wider access and more flexible learning. CVE can play a leading role.

Quality has been mentioned, but the picture which unfolded equally concerned **integration** and **sustainability**. It emerged that many CVE providers would like increasingly to move away from ad hoc, non-award-bearing short courses towards a more **strategically focussed** and more **structured** programme, with more optional accreditation. This might involve modules from longer courses. It would certainly integrate closely with undergraduate and postgraduate teaching and with research, thus becoming more sustainable. In the more vocational subject it would also reflect the growing interest of professional bodies in accreditation.

5.7 Personnel

Good CVE practitioners require levels of academic and entrepreneurial excellence which, it was reported, were often not reflected in their conditions of employment. This section refers briefly both to established academic posts and to the recent growth in temporary, or fixed-term, appointments.

Most university staff working in CVE have chosen to do so, having either applied for a specific CE post or volunteered from within a subject department. Their motivation is least likely to be commercial and most likely to be enthusiasm for spreading and sharing knowledge in their specialist field, or for CE in general. Indeed, pressure to raise revenue does not necessarily result in good practice in CVE. The location of CVE practitioners within the university does not appear to affect their ability to succeed, **the most important facilitating factor being support and encouragement from senior management**. This will be reflected in contracts, pay, promotion and status – the latter being reported to be more important than the former.

The main strategic purpose of CVE was to encourage **good relations**, on behalf of the university, by providing high quality teaching which was responsive to market needs.

> ***Academics must know their subject, know their market and be able to deliver.***

Being an expert in a subject, the normal requirement of an academic, is only one-third of the requirement. Knowing the market includes understanding the learning needs of practitioners of your subject. Delivery is frequently innovative, involving new learning methods and/or technology. Standards are demanding and feedback immediate. What policies were being used to obtain, and retain, staff who possessed these qualities?

The freedom of action in relation to tenured staff is limited and the findings concerned those aspects which were negotiable: **staff training, appraisal, promotion** and **status**.

(Reference to payment and private work are made in **5.4**.) Training, it was felt, should include induction training on CVE for all new staff. Status could be titular. Is it not time that the diversity of a university's mission was recognised by the wider use of prestigious titles, such as 'professor', to recognise the importance of more than research?

Harsher words were used about the nature, and increasing use, of short-term contracts for CVE staff. In many such appointments **the risk seemed not to be shared**, so much as transferred from the institution to the individual. Universities, as well as individual CVE practitioners, need to become more entrepreneurial.

5.8 Allocation of development funding

> *CE is for a brief period of four years uniquely advantaged within universities because it has indicative funding announced for the years 1991/92 - 94/95.*
>
> Ian Powell, UCACE Annual Conference, June 1991.

About a quarter of this money, around £10m. a year, is for course development - mainly CVE development. (The background to this portfolio funding of CE is described in **section 3.5**.) Earmarked grants for CVE development in individual universities range from very little to over £500,000 pa. and they have featured prominently in this project. Their allocation is reported here, and their management in **section 6.3**.

Each university is advised to discuss its CVE development plans with the DFE PICKUP Regional Development Agent (RDA), who is also asked by the UFC for advice when funding allocations are determined. In the three years of University Grants Committee (UGC) selective development funding (1987/88 - 89/90) the emphasis was on innnovative **projects** targetting the wealth creating industries. The UFC's intention is clearly to move from projects to funding **institutional strategies**

and total portfolios, though this very important change was, and is, only slowly permeating the system. A survey of all universities after the 1991/92 funding round stated that

> *in over half the cases universities indicated that they had done very little to change the bidding process.*

However, it went on to say:

> *In most cases the policy of strategic planning had the effect of giving the Director for CE a more central role in planning and decision making.*

It is not yet known whether CVE development funding will continue to be a separately identified element in the block grant after 1994/95. What is clear is that 'good practice' requires universities to make strong links between their **institutional plan, resourcing and CVE outputs**. Most of the funding identified is for independent project proposals. Portfolio funding does not in any way discourage this – and many of the case studies were proof of its success – but few universities were found to be monitoring development funding against overall development planning targets. Total outcomes were, however, the measure used by the UFC in monitoring the 1990/91 funding against institutional plans.

Selective funding has been used to move universities away from their traditional emphasis on the public sector (**3.3**). The emphasis on 'wealth creation' in the early years, and the more recent priority given to training in science and technology, have been reflected in both the external (UFC) and internal allocation of development funds.

CVE delivery and development funding in 1990/91

% of CVE delivery		% of development funding
Arts	5	2
Social Sciences	50	34
Engineering	10	16
Science	8	27
Medicine	9	3
Other (including INSET)	18	18

(Note: these figures are only approximate. Funding allocations were based on a 50% sample and delivery volumes are estimated from the nine subject categories used by the UFC.)

The earlier preference for 'innovation' has also tended to favour projects involving novel delivery methods, new markets, etc. Some of the case studies are excellent examples of successful innovations.

Good practice must be forward looking and the indications from this study were that **universities should not be over-dependent on development funding being separately identified** and at the current levels after 1994/95, though at the time of writing there is no indication of official policy on this. The best practice in the management and funding of CVE development described in the key issues should serve universities well and invariably involves **high level direction and approval of detailed plans which were democratically developed and 'owned' by the departments committed to CVE delivery**. A weakness, though, seemed to be a lack of selection criteria based on strategic planning objectives. Most seemed to depend unduly on independent project business plans.

I said earlier that you face both an opportunity and a threat and that time is short. If you are to succeed, I suggest that the challenge for you is to ensure that your institution, in its planning and resourcing, is persuaded to sign up very clear aims and specific objectives for CE and that these are then consistently worked through into individual programmes of action, resourcing decisions and organisational arrangements.

Ian Powell, June 1991.

This advice was for the whole of CE. It now seems as relevant to CVE as to LAE.

6. GOOD PRACTICE FOR CVE DIRECTORS

This chapter deals with the **facilitating role** of central CVE staff. For many this is their primary function, though over half (**3.4**) combined this with CVE delivery. There are strong arguments for both models and, **provided the CVE unit's own courses do not detract from its university-wide responsibilities**, they can plug gaps, provide examples of good practice and enhance the unit's academic credibility. The findings of this study echoed those of the UGC Working Party in January 1984.

> *One of the reasons why CE has remained a secondary activity in many universities is that responsibility for its constituent parts has been dispersed.*
>
> (Paragraph 53)

> *There should be an acknowledged focus of responsibility for CE commanding respect [...] internally and externally.*
>
> (Paragraph 54)

> *Command respect within the university, both academically and administratively.*
>
> (Paragraph 56)

This is more easily said than done and universities were still struggling to do this eight years after the Working Party's Report. Internal organisational structures are described in **5.2**. The key roles discussed in the following sections concern **internal support** and **external liaison**.

6.1 Planning and monitoring

Good planning and monitoring is all about clear ownership and rewards.

This section is about implementing the strategic plans which were described in **5.1**. The CVE unit will normally be the channel through which both plans and monitoring returns are passed. **This role has been greatly strengthened by the policies of the Funding Council**. A subsidiary role may be to develop a business or operational plan for the CVE unit itself, though this is most common in units which were required to be self-financing.

Strong central planning and monitoring of CVE was not found to be characteristic of the current situation, which resembled more ad hoc 'market trading'. **CVE units often felt they were responsible for meeting UFC targets even when they did not control the delivery.** Their plea was for more devolved responsibility (as well as devolved delivery), not for more central control. The elements of good practice were, therefore, that **delivering departments should be free to develop their own plans**, if they are genuinely to 'own' them; **but that such plans should be quantified and should be known to the CVE unit.**

The management of UFC development funding (**6.3**) was one, but far from the only, reason for serious monitoring. **The use of high quality management information on CVE plans and performance** seemed essential. Those universities with good systems also had high motivation, though which came first was not clear.

Our departments are desperate to get credit for CVE.

It is certainly difficult to believe in policy statements if little attention is paid to the **measurement of their outcomes (Appendix 6** . 'monitoring'). Planning and monitoring data are invariably developed and collected only in response to **external**

demands, yet are essential for internal policy and decision making, for example, capital investment in buildings (**5.3**), assessing the demand for CVE (**5.6**), and staff appointments (**5.7**).

Contributors referred to the use of both financial and FTE parameters for monitoring, but warned against setting revenue targets if these were not the primary objective of the university's CVE activity. **Section 5.6** refers to the importance of monitoring CVE provision by mode of delivery and by award. A few universities were regularly reviewing the use of their own resources (buildings and staff) for CVE, and slightly more were analysing their customer (student) profile. The value of having an 'acknowledged focus' for CVE must be reduced if it is not used to **collect, analyse and communicate** comprehensive information on the work for which it has special responsibility. Part of this 'monitoring' role may fall within the Registrar's area, indeed some felt it should, but the proper **use** of the data internally needs professionals specialising in CVE who can relate plans and performance to practice elsewhere and to the market.

6.2 Financial, administrative and marketing support

Throughout the study it was clear that universities had a very strong preference for **encouraging** subject departments, but not for **requiring** them to undertake CVE. Financial encouragement was described in **section 5.4**; it is the provision of professional advice and administrative services which is discussed here. Advice was being offered, free, by CVE units in all universities, together with some services, though how many of these were free varied enormously. The purpose of both advice and support services was to encourage and to achieve **quality** and **sustainability**.

All universities were seeking to encourage more departments and more staff to become involved in CVE. It was assumed that some would need help with identifying their market, pricing, targetting their promotional material,etc. They might also want to off-

load as much of the administrative burden as they could, in order to concentrate on the academic content of their CVE programmes.

> *All respondents cited that the updating of their own skills, prestige, self-esteem and professional development motivates the individual academic more than anything else.*

The CVE unit must ensure that each new course is successful, for the morale of academic providers, as well as for the institution. **The cost of failure is high**. Universities are all seeking to cover themselves against financial loss, and most of the 'free' help is on financial matters. **More important was the correct identification of the market and the design of the training, including price, to match precise needs**. A few universities are offering comprehensive marketing services, including market research, but these are more likely to be charged for. Many CVE units have copy-writing, design and sales expertise which is geared to the promotion of CVE using direct mail.

Good short course work is extremely demanding. Experience (and good computer software) can make so much difference that a common problem is how to balance these benefits against their true cost. Departments doing the work themselves are frequently operating at marginal costs, discounting the 'opportunity costs' of their staff, and therefore reluctant to pay the full cost of a central service. Yet it becomes increasingly difficult for a CVE unit to go on justifying the provision of a 'subsidised' service once a department has successfully launched a CVE programme.

All CVE units in the study reported passing on the direct costs of printing, postage, etc. They had different ways of charging labour. Some included it in the central overhead, others covered it by an additional CVE 'overhead', by a fee, or by dividing the surplus. But the need for flexibility was paramount, as the primary purpose was to encourage new entrants to the CVE market and protect quality. **The average short**

course fee (Section 5.4) is still insufficient to cover all the true costs. If the strategic benefits justify the present fee levels, universities must decide how best to provide professional financial, marketing and administrative services. There is little doubt that these services are sometimes needed.

More than half the universities surveyed had guidelines on their services and some had **handbooks of good practice**, with check-lists, advice on lead times and all sorts of do's and don'ts.

Profit is generated by meeting a customer's needs.

These needs may be far more than the immediate training, and a great deal of useful advice is included in some of the handbooks. For instance, when CVE units do provide services, the division of responsibilities between it and the department should be **clearly defined**. Also, every external participant (student, contributor or speaker) should have only **one contact point**, and departments should take **collective responsibility** to support their colleagues who are organising short courses. They may need to be available, in number, to meet with participants, if the spin-off advantages of CVE are to be realised and all future training needs met.

6.3 Support through R & D

Some CVE units are, as part of their function, conducting research into CE. All have major responsibilities for CVE development, both funded and unfunded. External funding for development is coming from the EC and from UK government departments, such as ED and DTI, as well as from the UFC.

The introduction by the UFC of support for CE research in 1990/91 has been particularly significant and was in addition to support for course development since 1986/87. The distinction between 'research' and 'development' would have been less

important if it had not been for this separate funding. UFC support has been used for some research into CE which will increase understanding, and improve performance, throughout the profession (the projects listed in **appendix 6** are examples). Investigations more focussed on individual university programmes, or their related training needs, are more likely to be classified as 'development'. Whereas the UFC policy has tended to be to support research undertaken within the CE department, development funding has been widely spread across each university.

Whether or not a CVE unit is funded to do research, it has a role to review CE developments which are potentially important to the institution. These might concern the demand for training, or ways in which it is delivered and evaluated. This knowledge should inform their advice to their university on CVE development and on the use of funding for it – which could be for CVE infra–structure as well as for developments in selected subject departments (**5.8**).

Support for R and D, as with planning and monitoring (**6.1**), has become one of the lead roles of CVE units. Both were closely linked to UFC earmarked funding, and both have been **successful in raising visibility and strengthening CVE**.

> *Recent changes in UFC development funding have improved management skills, linked to more systematic planning.*

> *The introduction of portfolio funding arrangements is a help to the head of CVE through the pressure for an integrated institutional approach.*

The planning and implementation of development funding, linked to an institutional plan, has increasingly involved senior university staff, as well as the RDA and CVE practitioners. There had been some move from funding 'concepts' to emphasing 'outcomes' and the procedures for using the funds were judged to be 'robust and responsive'. But it was also noted that some unsupported departments had made poor

use of development money. This was a further instance where the appointment of **departmental CVE co-ordinators** has been found valuable. Good practice in the management of development funding should reflect the sensitive balance between decentralised 'ownership' of academic work by departments and accountability.

> *Respondents recognised that monitoring was a means by which institutions could identify examples of good practice and assist in assuring quality.*

As in all other departmental CVE responsibilities, the central unit should be seen as a **resource**, to be used, and not as a bureaucracy, to be avoided. **Only when departments minded sufficiently about the successful outcomes of their CVE developments, did they seem to be making full use of the expertise of CVE professionals**. With this, some of the slippage in delivery and/or in spending might have been avoided.

6.4 Supporting teaching

Where CVE has become more 'mainstream', the central unit is more likely to find itself working with other specialists to support teaching. There is potential for profitable interaction on staff development, quality, curriculum, teaching methods and educational development. Where this was happening it was a major part of the unit's work.

Important reports have already been published on *Strategic Staff Development for PICKUP* (DES, 1990) and *Quality Assurance in University Continuing Vocational Education* (UCACE/TEED, 1992). Two recent UFC initiatives illustrate the key role being played by some CVE units in the development of 'mainstream' teaching: the Teaching and Learning Technology Programme and the Programme to Encourage Flexibility in Course Provision. Both illustrate the convergence of the aims of CE and of mainstream HE. It does not matter who takes the lead in supporting teaching; (in

many universities it was not the CVE unit), only that each university can take in and use new ideas, new technologies, new opportunities and new student groups. But there are quite a number of universities where the CE departments, and CVE units, are in the forefront of these changes. CE has a contribution to make, and is an obvious beneficiary of initiatives in modularisation and CATS (**sections 3.6** and **5.6**).

UCACE has wisely convened groups to share experience on part-time study, the use of new technology, quality, etc. These are as relevant now to CVE as to LAE. Most of the case studies in this project involved modular, award-bearing courses – many of them delivered flexibly. Some showed how students need, and can mutually give, support. Others described how quality started with agreement on learning objectives, even before the curriculum was decided. A full list is given in **appendix 4**.

Information on successful innovations in teaching was being given through a **CE newsletter**, or by frequent use of a general university newsheet, as well as by active involvement in **staff development**. Some CVE units were looking outside the university as well and working with external speakers and client companies to improve teaching. There were excellent examples of collaboration with Enterprise in Higher Education (EHE) programmes.

6.5 Relationships with central administration

Not all links will be established by the organisational structure, the physical location, or the nature of the staff appointed (eg. secondments/transfers). Some will just develop. But there were instances where important links with finance offices, registrar's departments, conference offices, admissions, publications, etc. were almost completely absent. This danger is greatest if CVE is part of a larger department, separate from the centre, which provides its own administrative services. If CVE units are to develop and implement strategic objectives across the whole university, good

practice requires **integration** with the central administration, as well as with the departments – with the top office as well as with the grass roots.

The link with the registrar's department is particularly important. Some CVE units answer to it directly and others, which are part of the faculty structure, have administrators seconded from it. But others are deliberately remote.

> *We want entrepreneurs who will get on their bikes and not be constrained by the precedents of past practice and current regulations.*

Academic staff enjoy autonomy and like to characterise in unflattering terms anyone, or anything, which seems to threaten it. However, there are also many opportunities. CVE is already extending access to learning by reaching new student groups and developing new learning methods. But 'more' not only means 'different', it also means, administratively, **more complex**. The new HE system, involving modularisation, work–based learning, CATS and much more, will not have room for 'us' and 'them' within the same institution.

6.6 External networking

The importance of external relations is highlighted in **section 5.5**. But being aware is not enough, universities as a whole and CVE practitioners in particular must be discerning. There were examples of considerable wasted effort. CVE units must know where their particular priorities lie and who their partners are inside and outside the institution.

Universities have two distinct interests which are reflected in their organisational structure (**section 5.2**), a general one in **external relations**, which promotes the institutional 'mission', and a second, which is unashamedly **commercial** and seeks to exploit invention and facilitate technology transfer. The first is in the central 'yolk of

the egg', while the second is often part of the 'white', operating through university companies. The first works with departments, while the second may negotiate more often on behalf of individual academics. CVE is part 'yolk' and part 'white'.

There is, of course, **great attraction in providing a well co-ordinated, if not a single, interface between the university and industry**. The obvious partner is the Industrial Liaison Office (ILO) referred to in **5.5**. Both CVE units and the ILO share a need to liaise closely with relevant EC Directorates. Four UK universities have achieved very close ties between the two and a few more have significant joint activities. **The links should be closer in more institutions**. This highly focussed 'commercial' networking does, for instance, make close links with development agencies and the DTI easier. Some employers also appreciate a single university link along the lines of an 'account executive'. The opportunities for university-wide 'commercial' networking are particularly strong in areas of high unemployment and special need. Training subsidies arising from this may be particularly welcome to small and medium enterprises (SMEs). Large universities, like large companies, will need to find ways of working in the same direction, even if not through a single unit.

> *The General Manager of Hitachi visited the institution to check out various facilities and, upon awarding the contract, said the deciding factor over three other HEIs was its professional accommodation, business approach and professional staff.*

There were many instances where networking needed to be on behalf of the whole university, despite the great diversity of markets served by its constituent departments. The project paid particular attention to the 82 Training and Enterprise Councils (TECs) now established in England and Wales (cf. **appendix 8**). They have a key role to play in developing training at all levels of scholarship. Their emphasis was initially on basic levels of training, but there are some early hints that a strategic link between TECs and universities is emerging. The Investors in People programme and the

National Education and Training targets will also be significant. It is clear that despite current difficulties being encountered by many universities in their relationship with TECs, there is a need to work on the links, locally and more widely.

Some universities have benefitted greatly from a range of initiatives to promote accredited, work-based, modular training such as the Employment Department's High Technology National Training (HTNT) and the DTI/SERC Integrated Graduate Development Scheme (IGDS). CVE units will increasingly need to tune into external networks for new development opportunities, new markets and accreditation. They may need to lead their universities to the best national frameworks for offering vocational awards, including National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs) and CATS. These are networks some way from the common stamping ground of ILOs. Many university training links involve professional bodies.

> *Professional bodies were influencing course design, encouraging participation and commitment to CPD amongst members, advising on accreditation, evaluation, marketing and establishing effective quality standards.*

More is said about networks of providing institutions, under the auspices of a professional body, in **section 7.3**, within the context of **departmental management**. This is where marketing plans are generally determined. Marketing arrangements embracing whole institutions, or groups of institutions, for the **delivery** of CVE have had little success. Few university-wide consortia have survived, unless they were closely linked to accreditation, linking with Europe, or with development agencies.

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), employers and professional bodies are all actively looking for better, and more cost effective, ways of improving mid-career training. The specialist role of CVE staff in these discussions is based on their professional

knowledge (**section 6.3**). By participating in many networks they are able to advise on best practice for different groups, learning situations and subjects.

> *Universities need to position themselves within an increasingly fragmented market. They would be wise to look at which markets they can satisfy most effectively and concentrate their efforts accordingly.*

6.7 Managing change

> *Change in universities is commonly affected more easily by stealth, by sleight of hand, than by mounting the pulpit.*
>
> Chris Duke, 'The Learning University', 1992.

Those taking part in this study knew what sort of changes they wanted. They shared, remarkably, many of the same visions. They wanted their universities to be **more responsive** to students' life-long training needs (i.e. the market), to be places where **partnerships abounded** and where training was for both **competence** and, if so desired, for **accreditation**.

The original extended project description (**appendix 1**) included a brief to look at 'the management of change'. The following recommendations emerged.

* Be clear about strategic objectives

* Avoid marginalising CVE and make sure it has well-informed support from protagonists with influence

* Work with the grain. Do not try to overlay 'top-down' plans if the culture is 'bottom-up'

* Give as much attention to internal as to external marketing. Work closely with natural partners

* Look for synergy between CVE and other mainstream academic activities

* Disregard heads of departments at your peril

* Try to convey the right messages through the built environment, the financial environment and through employment conditions

* Include CVE in the main academic arenas and involve it in discussions on academic audit, staff development, etc.

* Be enterprising. Strengthen the 'commercial' as well as the 'academic' links

Universities have become extremely sensitive to funding - particularly from the Funding Councils. CVE staff can further their own cause by keeping abreast of all

policy statements and funding opportunities (which should include maintaining close relationship with their RDA). This is also referred to in **chapter 8**.

7. GOOD PRACTICE FOR HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS

This is the last, and shortest, of the three 'good practice' chapters. It would have been longer if it had come sooner, as the study was based on

> *the integration of continuing vocational education (CVE) into other university activities*

This is a chapter for **practitioners who have decided that CVE does have a place alongside degree teaching, research and consultancy in their department**, but have the classic management problem of allocating limited resources in response to competing demands.

7.1 Departmental planning

> *We have an executive development programme because we could not be a credible business school without one.*

Some called this 'positioning oneself in the market', others said it was essential interaction with practitioners working in areas where the department wished to be strong, and to be seen to be strong.

> *What is the right balance between CVE and other work?*

It was rare for the CVE FTEs to exceed 10% of the FSNs, unless additional academic appointments for this work were possible (this is referred to again in the next **section 7.2**). This figure may increase if the links with research and/or degree teaching (through modular provision) are exceptional.

One Social Science Department produced four books as a result of short courses held during the last two years.

Two approaches to planning were observed. The first delegated responsibility to a 'CE co-ordinator' who was known to be an enthusiast, but who had only vague encouragement and no agreed policy. The second approach was more strategic. CVE plans were based on **dual competence** in both academic expertise and knowledge of specified markets in which the department had decided, collectively, **to establish high quality, sustainable training links**. Such a strategic plan, whether linked to UFC development funding or not, would be quantified in terms of total outputs (both FTEs and revenue) for CVE in that department.

Few examples were found of CVE planning targets across a department. Where they did exist, they were more likely to specify revenue than FTEs (**section 5.4**), even though this may not reflect the strategic objectives.

Ownership of the department's CVE strategy was good because it had been talked through thoroughly.

Targets, it was felt, should not be imposed, either by the university or by the HoD, but agreed. Such agreement will not always be possible – certainly so long as the perception persists that CVE detracts from research and undergraduate teaching. There was, interestingly, a good correlation in those universities studied between high CVE delivery and good research rating. There was also a very positive relationship between CVE, staff development and curriculum development. Short courses, or distance learning materials, were often the spur to improve teaching more generally.

7.2 Self-financing units

FTE student numbers on CVE programmes are unlikely to exceed 10% of FSNs unless additional academic appointments are made.

> *Departments can often create commercial offices which draw on a mixture of academic and external resources.*
>
> *They indicated that expertise gained by developing and presenting high quality CVE to industry helped to develop centres of excellence, benefitting research, consultancy and undergraduate and postgraduate teaching.*

Such offices or centres ranged from little more than a notional grouping of a few staff, perhaps with a letterhead and a budget code, to large free-standing institutes dedicated to a professional area (eg health service administration, advanced architectural studies, engineering). As this study is concerned with **transferable** good practice, it investigated the former, rather than the latter (ie low cost, high profile units, based within subject departments).

Many examples of such self-financing units were found. To the uninitiated their titles could sound esoteric: window cladding, computational hydraulics, child protection, public order, fluid power, vibration, disaster, TQM, conflict resolution. Their importance emerged too late in the project to be studied as a 'key issue', so more information would be useful. What is clear is that:

* they signalled a strategic commitment, by the department, to adopt a particular **market position**, as a centre of excellence for the study of that particular subject

* they involved **external practitioners** in their management and their work (research and CVE)

* they attracted **external funding** from, for example, the EC, government and charitable foundations

* they employed staff on **non-standard contracts**, often short-term and including CVE as a normal duty

* they had an **integrated portfolio** of research, consultancy and teaching. CVE was always a significant, and sometimes the dominant, activity

* they were 'self-financing.'

With so many advantages, what was the down-side? First, universities were conscious of the kudos of designated 'offices', 'units', 'centres', and 'institutes' and each title may have to be approved by Senate, having fulfilled certain requirements. But the advantages were often less obvious to the staff employed within them. Their conditions of employment were often different, and perceived as inferior, and their requirement to be self-financing was an additional constraint.

> *The necessity to develop activities on a self-financing basis could lead to conservatism and a reluctance to be innovative. Most importantly, it could have the effect of making staff feel under pressure and unbalanced – in that generating income became their raison d'être.*

These, in themselves, were more irritants than barriers to good practice, unless compounded by other separations from the host department. The advantage of designated units is that the staff within them have particular responsibilities; the

disadvantage is that others may then feel that they have no responsibility to assist with CVE. However, **a very large proportion of CVE is being delivered from such units**.

7.3 Secure markets

High quality CVE involves considerable investment (time and money) which requires a secure market if it is to be justified through sustainable delivery. In many cases this depends on extremely small numbers of academic staff with the 'dual competence' referred to in **7.1**. If, in addition, their teaching is at the 'leading edge' of their subject and linked closely to research, the shelf-life, or 'product life-cycle', of any one programme is likely to be short. How do one or two experts develop a secure market?

The problem is common to all higher level teaching and is only more apparent in CVE if the students are more demanding than those on longer courses. But the problem is a real one and some extremely useful ideas were advanced in both the **case studies** and **key issue** reports. Sustainability was normally associated with a niche market which could be defined by **subject, client group, mode of delivery,** or **collaborative partner** and usually involved a combination of these. Universities have traditionally served client groups which are clearly defined by either their location, or their profession – often by both. The two longest established markets for CVE, education and medicine, are good examples. But many departments now recruit students, and adopt 'market positions', which are national or international, rather than local, though still concentrating on 'professional' areas. **Collaboration with professional bodies, some of it at a local level, has increased, but needs to be developed further.**

Although niche markets are most likely to be defined primarily by the professional, or subject interest there is also some strong feeling that the needs of each university's local market should not be neglected – even in the more recently developed

commercial areas such as engineering and management. The important issue is that CVE investment decisions should be made strategicly and that CVE delivery should be sustainable.

> *A better route than ad hoc open-recruiting short courses is modules which can be accumulated towards an award.*

> *Programmes which carry awards are probably the most highly regarded by students and are the most likely to continue to recruit during a recession.*

The growth in award-bearing CVE is described in **section 5.6**. It concerns equally the 'non-graduate' and the 'graduate' professions, both of which are increasingly seeking accredited continuing professional development (CPD) for upgrading and updating their members' qualifications. Some professional bodies are actively seeking to **extend learning opportunities for their members** by encouraging selected universities to make special provision for them. In return for the security of this professional 'sponsorship', universities are developing specialist programmes.

Most award-bearing modules can also be taken as free-standing, not-for-credit, courses. Where awards are taken they can be towards a university or professional qualification (or both) with, or without, opportunities for credit transfer (CATS). Universities, together with their colleagues in the professions, are beginning to take some tentative steps to **manage the market**, as well as respond to it, by creating structured opportunities for CVE which are planned to cover all subjects, geographical regions and modes of delivery.

Structured, secure markets are also being created with clients outside a professional association, sometimes singly, sometimes in groups or 'clubs'. Such employers might also have been sponsoring students on long courses, providing work experience or

obtaining consultancy. Teaching companies are just one example and are referred to again in **chapter 8**. The case studies provided excellent examples of clients defining their training needs, and designing programmes, in close association with a chosen department. These were examples of 'shared ownership'.

> *All HoDs felt CVE should be a 'mainstream' activity and that they would do more if the markets for CVE were more stable.*

> *The responses indicated that a better understanding of marketing and market research methods would be beneficial.*

'Dual competence' has been referred to and **section 5.7**, on personnel, added a third competence to 'academic expertise' and 'knowledge of the market', which was **delivery skills**. It may be that too little emphasis is given to this. A 'Directional Policy Matrix, like the concept of dual competence, matches the training needs of each market segment against academic strength. Or, from another study, 'spotting market niches demands creative, imaginative individuals'. This was most easily achieved in departments where there were strong links with professional groups: architecture, engineering, law, pharmacy, social work, etc, but can equally develop from links with Industrial Training Organisations (ITOs), TECs and major employers. The study did successfully identify examples of stable markets. Indeed, **appendix 9** shows that there was very little decline in CVE in 1990/91, despite the recession.

Security depends on both the stability of the total market and competition within it. There was considerable evidence that the training market was elastic and that **high quality training stimulated an increased demand**. There was some evidence that increased competition could **reduce** customer choice, by reducing the profitability of some very specialist provision to the point where it was unsustainable. The professional bodies and training organisations will need to consider which markets need

to be 'managed', using designated training providers, in order to give the security needed by them to support their investment in developing specialist courses.

7.4 Staff selection, development and motivation

Whenever new appointments are being made, **CVE should be listed amongst the normal academic duties** and should be included in **induction training**. Thereafter it should automatically appear, amongst all other mainstream academic activities, in **annual appraisal**, **staff development** and **promotion criteria**. But these are not enough.

> *The perception was still that promotion depended on output in research and scholarship only.*

CVE does offer substantial opportunities, particularly to younger staff, to achieve both career and personal goals through recognition by practitioners of their subject. Employer contacts lead to consultancies and research, and opportunities to share their knowledge while improving it. Some are attracted by the opportunity to work with non-traditional students in a reflective and supportive way. The list is much longer and will be familiar to all who have been infected and enthused by continuing education. CVE can be both appealing and threatening.

> *This strongly points to inexperienced staff collaborating with experienced staff – possibly from other departments.*

The research indicated that **too much reliance should not be put on financial incentives** to the individual, though these were common and could be important to those on lower salaries. Rewards in kind, such as expenses for travel, were tending to be preferred. As **external recognition**, **self-esteem** and **personal development** are powerful motivators to undertake CVE, what more appropriate reward is there than

increased opportunities to participate in conferences and to become part of wider networks of practitioners?

7.5 Strategies for success

The ingredients for success have been identified in previous sections. This is by way of a summary of the points which are particularly relevant to HoDs. The first is **integration**, the second **niche marketing** and the third **quality.**

The externally imposed demand will certainly be to 'do more with less' and this must mean taking advantage of whatever synergy is possible between long and short courses and between CVE and research. Integration with other mainstream work is not confined to the academic content. It includes 'client groups, modes of delivery and collaborative partners' **(section 7.3). Departments will need to be selective in who they work with, and who they work for, looking for long-term relationships with the prospect of strategic benefits (section 3.1)**. The same discernment is needed throughout departmental planning of CVE. New modes of delivery, for instance computer-assisted learning, cannot be justified unless they are going to offer benefits on a variety of degree, as well as CVE, programmes. New accreditation arrangements must, similarly, be part of a coherent departmental plan.

'Niche marketing' embraces the same range of parameters: subject, student group, type of delivery, etc, with particular emphasis on the **benefits** the training offers to the customer. The dual, or triple, competences of academic expertise, knowledge of the market and delivery skill are at the heart of identifying such niches. The department should seek to offer unique learning opportunities, or to exploit particular student loyalties (eg organisations with whom they already have strong ties, local area, franchising, alumni).

Universities have historically offered a quality product, costing more than training from other education providers. The most successful CVE providers are often at the top end of the market and selling on **quality**. This is not easily achieved. It is often a myth that poor quality training does not sell, or receive repeat business. It may – for a time. Only through careful planning, collective commitment and proper monitoring, will quality be achieved. Important though planning and monitoring are, the most critical component is the enthusiastic, shared ownership of the activities by all those responsible for them and pride in their programme. It is up to all who are responsible for CVE to ensure that this enthusiasm is well directed.

8. WIDER OUTCOMES

In addition to the findings summarised in **chapter 1**, some important issues arose which go beyond the project's initial brief. They concern professional networking in the new post-binary HE system, CE monitoring and CE funding.

All three were also of interest to the DFE PICKUP Regional Development Agents and this provides a further opportunity to thank them for their help at every stage of this project. The generous assistance of Cynthia Holme of the USR in providing up-to-date CVE statistics is also very much appreciated.

8.1 Professional networking

The project was an experiment in professional networking and proved to be extremely productive and rewarding (chapter 2). CVE practitioners from nearly 50 institutions had participated by its conclusion, with benefits to them and to others through UCACE. The Universities Council is looking forward to joining with CE practitioners from the 'new' universities. The 'new task' referred to in the introduction is now waiting to be undertaken. The polytechnics Association of Industrial Liaison Officers (AILO) is much more widely involved in CVE than its 'old' university counterpart, University Directors of Industrial Liaison (UDIL) and this may mean that the Polytechnic Association for Adult Continuing Education (PACE, now NUPACE), which is UCACE's obvious partner, is somewhat less involved in CVE. This same difference in emphasis exists between some of the 'old' universities and is referred to in **sections 5.2** and **5.5.**

If the benefits of mutual support and collaboration, so successfully developed in UCACE over many years, are to be maintained and widened to include the 'new' universities, then a lot of work will have to be done. Many of the participants in this project were venturing into this sort of collaboration for the first time. There were

doubts about its usefulness and concerns regarding confidentiality. The confidence and trust which have been established must now be extended by sustaining this kind of analysis and professional development work throughout the new, enlarged university system.

8.2 CE monitoring

The USR's collection of data on continuing education through the CER has recently been reviewed by a group established by the USR's Management Committee. Others are looking at **Form 3**. The CER Review Working Group's findings have been endorsed by some of the investigations undertaken as part of this project. Monitoring activities were largely being dictated by the external requests for data by the USR and the UFC, yet the need for good quality information, internally, was also very great. New combined higher education statistical records are provisionally scheduled for introduction in 1994/95 – two years later than the introduction of the revised CER had originally been planned.

The project has indicated considerable confusion in the use, and interpretation, of the current records (CER and **Form 3)**. This is already inhibiting effective planning and monitoring, and the problems are likely to increase. Much valuable work has now been done to clarify the problem, but there could be two more years of increasing confusion if little is done before 1994/95. This is a second area where urgent action would seem to be needed.

8.3 CE funding

Universities commitment to CVE is real, but fragile (section 5.1). This commitment was, in large part, a reflection of the perceived commitment of the Funding Council. The message emerging from this project, which is independent of the introduction of the new Higher Education Funding Councils, concerns the potency of funding in

affecting change. **Earmarked grants from the Funding Council have been the most potent influence for positive change. Section 6.7** on managing change ends on this note. Earlier **sections (5.8 and 6.3)** draw attention to the good effects of the UFC's requirement of strategic plans and portfolio funding. Their importance lies in the clarity of the message they give and their influence on planning and monitoring. These are doing more than anything else to further the Government's wish 'to see universities increase the quantity and improve the quality of CVE' **(chapter 2)**. Even more could be done.

Senior managers lack confidence that they would continue to receive government support long-term, and across different agencies, if they irrevocably commit their university to major investment in CVE in staffing, buildings and departmental plans. There was genuine support from committed individuals, but some were waiting for further evidence of long-term, integrated support. They were curious, for instance, that Research Council initiatives for Interdisciplinary Research Centres (IRCs), for IGDS and Teaching Company Schemes, not to mention research contracts, make no mention of any wider integration with CE, or the wider dissemination of good practice and research findings through short courses, learning materials, conferences and seminars. Still more could be done to convince higher education institutions that CVE must become an integrated mainstream activity 'alongside research and degree teaching'.

> *there seemed to be too little confidence (that a strong CVE profile would pay off)*

> *institutional commitment was very real, but fragile.*

APPENDIX 1

CONTINUING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN UNIVERSITIES: PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION

PROPOSED RESEARCH PROJECT: EXTENDED DESCRIPTION

1. The aim of the project will be to spread good practice by identifying a series of key issues and showing how the most successful providers have overcome the problems involved.

2. Providers may be whole universities, central continuing education departments within universities, selected subject departments, or some combination of these. It is not assumed that there is a preferred organisational arrangement which is appropriate to all universities, or even to all departments within the same university.

3. The project will begin on 1 February 1991 and last for 12 months. It will comprise the following components.

Good Practice

4. This will invoive a quick survey of all universities to establish a broad consensus of what constitutes good practice. It will also enable examples of good practice to be located though the research will cover institutions at different stages of development of their vocational CET. Indeed, it will be important to include institutions who provide little vocational CET in order to identify the inhibiting factors and how these might be overcome.

5. The advice of PICKUP RDAs will be sought as appropriate.

Key Issues

6. Key issues will be teased out both deductively and inductively, the two approaches to be carried out concurrently, using different researchers.

7. **Deductively**, examples of good practice will be taken from PICKUP personnel and UCACE members. Through analysis of case studies it will be possible to deduce some of the transferable conditions associated with good practice. It will be important to distinguish **necessary** from **desirable** conditions. Particular attention will be paid to the integration of vocational CET within the institution, to the balance between CET and other work, and to the relationship between vocational CET and non-vocational adult education. The case studies will be used to identify problems which had to be overcome before success was achieved and to describe how this was done.

8. The case study approach will be supplemented by an **inductive** approach which will draw on what is already known about critical problem areas in the provision of vocational CET, for example:

financial incentives
conditions of service
departmental planning and review
monitoring
staff development
organisational structures
integration with degree teaching
integration with research
marketing

exploiting secure markets (including links with professional bodies)

Again, the satisfactory resolution of some of the above problems may be **necessary** condition for successful vocational CET provision, while the resolution of others may be **desirable**. In each category, guidelines on good practice will be developed.

Mechanisms for Implementation

9. A commitment to CET is included in most university planning statements but there are difficulties in converting institutional policy into effective action. This part of the research will look at the management of change rather than the on-going management of CET activity. Particular attention will be given to the effects of devolving budgetary responsibility to departments.

Report and Dissemination

10. The main outcome of the research will be the production of practical guidelines for use by institutions. Subject to the findings of the research, these guidelines will be produced in the form of individual documents on individual problem areas. An overall report of the reasearch will also be produced though this is likely to be brief (and will, in any event, include a management summary). The research report and the guidelines will be available by 1 January 1992.

11. Informal dissemination of the research findings will be undertaken in the course of the research, through informal contacts, appropriate conferences and meetings, and the like.

12. Formal dissemination of the findings will be considered at a later stage, on the basis that printing and distribution of the report and the guidelines would be undertaken by UCACE subject to consideration of additional financial support from the DES.

APPENDIX 2

MEMBERSHIP OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Mr John Bushnell	DFE
Professor Chris Duke (Project Director)	University of Warwick
Mr John Farrant	UFC
Mr John Geale (Project Manager)	University of Bradford
Ms Celia Jones	Northampton TEC
Dr Russell Moseley	UCACE; University of Warwick
Dr Stella Parker	UCACE; City University
Ms Ros Seyd	TEED
Mr Morry van Ments (Chairman)	University of Loughborough
Mr Stephen Williams	DFE
Mr David Young	CVCP

APPENDIX 3

PROJECT OUTLINE AND METHODOLOGY

Discussion of the project started with a paper tabled by the DES at their meeting with UCACE on 5 February 1990. During the next year it was developed into a firm project proposal (**appendix 1**) and work started early in 1991.

DATE	ACTIVITY	SAMPLE
1991 April/May	Questionnaire	52 Member universities 29 Responses
June *	Identification of case studies and key issues to be investigated and the methodology to be used	
Sept/Oct *	6 Regional briefing seminars	46 Participants
Nov/Dec *	Case study investigations	13 Researchers
1992 Jan–May *	Key issue investigations	17 Researchers
May/June	University visits/seminars conducted by Project Manager	21 Universities

* At each of these stages briefing notes were circulated to the UCACE membership. There was a more frequent exchange of research material between the participating universities. The products thus became part of the process.

Sessions for discussion and report were held at:

* UCACE Annual Conference, Exeter, 25/27 March 1991

* 5th National PICKUP Conference, UEA, 16/18 September 1991

* UCACE AGM, Glasgow, 30/31 October 1991

* UCACE Annual Conference, Manchester, 13/15 April 1992

* 6th National PICKUP Conference, Nottingham, 23/25 September 1992

* Also at each of the UCACE CVE Steering Committee meetings during the period of the project.

Individual investigators who produced case studies and key issues were also responsible for the independent dissemination of their own material, as well as feeding their findings into the project. This resulted in many publications, presentations and conference papers.

Complete lists of the case study and key issue reports are given in appendices 4 and 5. Most case study reports are published in pairs and their findings have been fed into the key issue investigations.

There are eleven key issue reports, as 4 of the 7 issues were studied independently by different people.

No attempt has been made to precis these reports in the main report, though their findings are the basis for the comment and the identification of the **key points**. Readers wishing to obtain the constituent reports should contact the authors at the addresses given in the appendices.

Methodology

At the outset a questionnaire was sent to all UCACE members. It had five purposes:

(i) to establish a broad consensus about what contributes to good practice in CVE

(ii) to identify examples of good practice in universities at different stages in the development of CVE (case studies)

(iii) to establish an initial list of key issues

(iv) to seek volunteers to investigate the case studies and key issues

(v) to locate concurrent and overlapping research being undertaken by universities into good practice in CVE (the survey findings are given in appendix 5).

The questionnaire was extremely brief but sufficient for the project manager to feed back to the UCACE membership:

* a list of criteria of good practice

* suggested pairs of case studies

* the grouping of 'key issues' under seven thematic headings

* the names of volunteers.

Interaction, with frequent feed–back, characterised the methodology. Through this, some omissions were corrected, while other important subjects were dropped, because it was subsequently decided that they could be dealt with better elsewhere.

The PICKUP Regional Development Agents (RDAs) were involved from the start, completing questionnaires and attending the regional briefing seminars. Each key issue investigator has worked with an RDA who has helped in whatever way they were asked.

There was also interaction between the case study and key issue investigators, both of whom were asked to illustrate the agreed criteria of good practice.

The three principal criteria – sustainability, quality and integration – are described in section 4. They, and other criteria, were discussed at the regional briefing seminars and a work plan agreed in which the case studies and key issue investigations would be mutually supportive.

* Each pair of case studies was highly focused – selecting as their theme just one, or two, aspects of good practice (taken from the criteria and/or the key issues).

  The pairs of researchers were taken from different universities where the project manager believed there were characteristics (but not customers) in common.

* The key issue investigations built on information from the questionnaire and from the case studies, but their content was renegotiable. Each researcher refined the brief to what they, and the RDA, thought would be manageable and

immediately useful. (For instance, the key issue 3 brief was extended to include polytechnics and key issue 6.1 did less on internal links with other central services in order to do more on external links with TECs).

Feedback was not confined to the separate investigations, nor restricted just to the briefing notes and conference sessions already mentioned. The project manager visited 16 of the universities which had contributed, plus a further 5 which had not, to collect information on good practice, to meet with practitioners to share experience, and to disseminate the findings. The discussions of draft papers involved some amendments, but more importantly they have been the vehicle for further discussion – and implementation. We are confident that much implementation will have preceded the publication of this report.

APPENDIX 4

CASE STUDY REPORTS

The following case studies were undertaken and reports on each pair of studies are available from the addresses shown below. (Where there is a charge for printing and postage, this is shown).

Case Study 1: Two CE Stars

MSc Construction Management by Distance Learning
University of Bath
Modular Courses for Actuaries
City University

Jan Woodley, Assistant Director in Continuing Education, University of Bath.

Caroline Leigh, Short Courses Manager, City University.

Available from:

Jan Woodley
Assistant Director of
Continuing Education
University of Bath
BA2 7AY

Caroline Leigh
Short Courses Manager
City University
Northampton Square
LONDON
EC1V 0HB

These two programmes were selected by the authors as 'stars'. They have some common threads around the themes of :

* collaboration
* marketing and flexibility
* quality
* sustainability

They represent good practice in terms of efficient team work, relevance in the market place, professional presentation of learning materials and continuous improvement in response to regular monitoring, evaluation and review.

Case Study 2: The Benefits of Networking and Support for Part-time Students and the Motivating Power of Qualifications: Two Aspects of Good Practice in Continuing Vocational Education

Mr Derek Saunders, Manager of Continuing Education in the Department of Materials Science and Engineering, University of Surrey.

Mrs Deborah Walker, Tutor, Health and Safety Group, Centre for Extension Studies, University of Loughborough.

Available from:

Mr Derek Saunders
Manager of Continuing Education in
the Depart. of Materials Science & Engineering
University of Surrey
GUILFORD
Surrey
GU2 5XH
Tel.0483 509378

Part-time, modular, award bearing courses from Loughborough (Diploma) and Surrey (MSc) were compared and contrasted. Networking and student support emerged as a powerful ingredient of success, generating a flow of support, knowledge and expertise between students, course tutors and industry experts. In addition, both courses demonstrated the importance of qualifications (academic and professional) for the personal and career development of individuals.

Case Study 3: Responding to client demand

Information Technology Associate Company Scheme (ITACS)
University of Stirling
Fife Health Board – University of Stirling Foundation Management Programme
University of Strathclyde

Carol Stewart, Educational Development Officer, University of Stirling.

Dr Archie Fleming, Director of Continuing Education, University of Strathclyde.

Available from:

Carol Stewart
Educational Development
Officer
Educational Policy and
Development
University of Stirling
STIRLING
FK9 4LA

Dr Archie Fleming
Director of Continuing
Education
University of Strathclyde
McCance Building
16 Richmond Street
GLASGOW
G1 1XQ

The case studies identify various aspects of good practice in CVE which are demonstrated by the two activities – marketing, quality assurance, commitment. However, the fundamental lesson to be learned from them is the need for responsiveness to client demands. The case studies illustrate how many examples of good practice follow from close working with the customer to ensure that the "product" is right.

Case Study 4: Engineering CPD – A Comparative Study

Robert Neal, Senior Teaching Fellow, Continuing Education Unit, School of Engineering, Computing and Mathematical Sciences, University of Lancaster.

Clive Nicholas, Continuing Education and Training Officer, Office of Adult Continuing Education, University of Exeter.

Available from:

Robert Neal
Senior Teaching Fellow
Continuing Education Unit
School of Engineering
Computing and Mathematical Sciences
University of Lancaster
LANCASTER
LA1 4YR
Tel. 0524 65201 Ext. 3090
Fax. 0524 381707
Telex. 65111 L ncul G

This case study compares the experience of the Universities of Lancaster and Exeter in developing, marketing and running Continuing Professional Development (CPD) courses for engineers. The Lancaster experience is based upon established a master degree course in Project Engineering from which a range of short courses have been developed, whilst the Exeter experience is based upon a series of short courses activities which gave rise to a modular master degree course in Logistics Engineering. Comparisons are drawn in a number of areas including marketing, integration, quality and finance. The study shows that, although there is much in common in the

experience of both institutions which has led to the development of best practice, there are still areas where comparison has identified different approaches which have been equally successful.

Case Study 5: Initiating and Sustaining Niche Markets in Continuing Education

Mr Tim Osborn-Jones, Director of the External Services Division, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

Professor Anne Jones, Director of Continuing Education, Brunel, The University of West London.

Available from:

Mr Tim Osborn-Jones
Director of the External
Services Division
SOAS
Thornhough Street
Russell Square
LONDON
WC1H 0XG

Professor Anne Jones
Director of Continuing
Education
Brunel University
UXBRIDGE
Middlesex
UB8 3PH

The case studies focused on the development and sustainability of specialised Continuing Education courses (ie. Japanese Briefings and Manufacturing Metrology) for niche markets at full cost.

In both cases marketing, programme content, staffing and quality control issues were examined.

Case Study 6: Engineering Training as CVE: General Lessons Learnt from Achieving and Maintaining Quality Provision

Alan Appleyard, IGDS Co-ordinator, University of Liverpool.

Christopher Ellis, Director of OPIT, University of Nottingham.

Available from:

Alan Appleyard
IGDS Co-ordinator
Faculty of Engineering
The University of Liverpool
PO Box 147
LIVERPOOL
L69 3BX

Christopher Ellis
Director of OPIT
The University of Nottingham
NOTTINGHAM
NG7 2RD

Successful practice can be, and often is, restricted to a limited product range: Liverpool's experience with IGDS and Nottingham's with distance learning illustrates that this does not need to be short courses. It may require staff development which creates a mutually reinforcing exercise between successful achievement of relevance and integration. Clients increasingly ask for delivery mechanisms which are specific to CVE (on-site training, work-based training, also training which explicitly addresses issues of competence). This shows that the three aims of 'good practice' (sustainability, integration and quality) are mutually supportive and where there is difficulty achieving any one of them it is helpful to look at inadequacies in the others as indirect causes of the problem being addressed. For example, obviously the irrelevance of a training programme damages its sustainability, but the opposite can also be true, as sustained training relations with a given client or niche market facilitates ability to attain and maintain relevance, particularly so when the pace of change is great.

Case Study 7: **The Financial Viability of Continuing Vocational Education in Universities** (3 case studies)

Jane Goodwin, Project Consultant, Department of Continuing Education, University of Oxford.

Available from:
(enclosing £2.00 for printing and postage)

Department of Continuing
Education
University of Oxford
Rewley House
1 Wellington Square
OXFORD
OX1 2JA

or direct from:
Jane Goodwin Associates
Panstar House
13–15 Swankeleys Road
Ickenham
UXBRIDGE
UB10 8DF

The case studies describe the financial management in three UK universities and is an attempt to determine whether the stand–alone provision of CVE can be self–sustaining. The case studies examine CVE financial management and decision making at departmental, central unit and institutional levels, measurements of effectiveness and the financial future. They ask 'is CVE a business?'

APPENDIX 5

KEY ISSUE REPORTS

The following key issues were investigated and a report on each is available from the addresses shown below. (Where there is a charge for printing and/or postage, this is shown).

Key Issue 1: Financial Control and Encouragement

John Geale, Honorary Senior Researcher in Adult Continuing Education, University of Lancaster.

Available from:

John Geale
Office of Adult Continuing Education
Storey Institute
Meeting House Lane
LANCASTER
LA1 1TH

The financial administration of CVE was investigated in twenty-one British universities. The systems of 'control' include responsibility for determining budgets, fees and central overheads. Financial incentives to individuals and/or departments are the principal 'encouragement' described in this report. The report does not give a blue-print for 'best practice', as each university was different, but it does record the wide

range of procedures being used and point to those elements which appeared to be critical. This was the key issue which most universities nominated as 'currently impeding the development of more and better CVE'.

Key Issue 2: Management of UFC Development Funding

Professor Ted Thomas, Head of Continuing Education, University of Bristol.

David Shepherd, Director of Continuing Education, University of York.

Available from:

David Shepherd
Director of Continuing Education
University of York
The King's Manor
YORK
YO1 2EP

This study investigated how universities had planned, allocated and managed their UFC funding for CE course development in 1990/91 and 1991/92. The need for long-term strategic planning coupled with suitable budgeting processes and clear monitoring systems were seen by the authors to be critical. Many universities had gone a good way to achieving this. The paper analyses the replies from some forty universities to a dozen specific questions and it concludes that, despite continuing misunderstandings about development funding, it was proving to be extremely valuable. The authors believed that improved management skills had resulted as a direct consequence of the UFC's funding strategy and that it had led to more strategic planning and had encouraged initiatives which had raised the visibility of, and strengthened, CE.

Based on the responses to the questionnaire, a model for the management of UFC funded projects is proposed which is likely to be applicable in a wide range of situations.

Key Issue 3: The Role of Academic Staff

Dr Stella Parker, Head of Continuing Education, City University.

Dr Sue Gray, RDA, Thames Valley and North West London.

Available from:

Dr Stella Parker
Head of Department of Continuing Education
City University
Northampton Square
LONDON
EC1V 0HB
Tel. 071 477 8250

The academic staff who work in the 'old' universities in continuing vocational education (CVE) have conditions of service which appear to be more flexible than those who do similar work in polytechnics. Apart from a small number of university staff who are required by contractual obligations to work in this area, most university staff who do, have **chosen** to do so. Polytechnic staff are generally **required** to do so.

The location of CVE practitioners within an organisation does not appear to affect their ability to achieve the aims of CVE. In their views, the most important facilitating factors are in the hands of senior management. They need to:

> Define clearly their purposes with respect to CVE. These purposes must be transmitted across the organisation through departments via departmental needs.

Provide support for these purposes by recognising the importance of applied research, interdisciplinary activities, and links with internal and external groups.

Demonstrate the importance of new methods of working by recognising them through promotion or some other means.

Clarify conditions of service for CVE practitioners.

Invest in suitable accommodation and facilities, adequate support services and programmes of training for all concerned with CVE.

Key Issue 4.1: Departmental Management (Mainstreaming)

Tim Bilham, Director of Continuing Education, University of Bath

Available from:

Tim Bilham
Centre for Continuing Education
University of Bath
Claverton Down
BATH
BA2 7AY

This study focuses on issues relating to the 'mainstreaming' of continuing vocational education (CVE) with particular reference to issues affecting academic subject departments in universities. As a result of interviews in seven universities in Southern England and Wales it analyses strategic implementation for CVE, ownership of CVE objectives, departmental planning and review and the role of heads of departments. It considers staff development, institutional development, evaluation and accountability in relation to three key themes: quality, sustainability and integration, and identifies a range of techniques, policies and procedures which could be considered as 'good practice'. It concludes that much of the initiative, innovation and enterprise for CVE emanates from dedicated CE departments, or centres, and not from other subject departments and as a consequence that UK universities are very far away from the real 'mainstreaming' of CVE.

Key Issue 4.2: Departmental Management (Integration)

Ken Nixon, Lecturer in Continuing Education, University of Sheffield

This study was based on an investigation and a report, "Implementing Strategic Staff Development for Continuing Education", which is available from:

Professor Geoffrey Chivers
Division of Adult Continuing Education
University of Sheffield
85 Wilkinson Street
SHEFFIELD
S10 2GJ

Interviews with selected heads of academic departments yielded information about definition, strategic planning, resources and reward systems for continuing education in each department. Descriptions were extracted of the activities of the eight most active departments, their involvement in CE and how far it is regarded as a normal part of each department's work.

The findings were that some departments, usually those in professional and technical fields, regard Continuing Vocational Education as a normal part of their work but not necessarily crucial to their healthy progress. Some provide CVE as a marginal activity and some have little or no involvement and no desire to become involved. A few departments are deeply committed to CVE work and regard it as essential to their survival. Similar patterns were found in several other universities.

Key Issue 4.3: The Integration of CVE in Scottish Universities

Mrs Susan Ferguson, Market Development Officer, External Educational Services, University of Glasgow

Dr Ian Chapman, Director of Vocational Studies, University of Dundee

Available from:

Dr Ian Chapman
Centre for Continuing Education
The University
Nethergate
DUNDEE
DD1 4HN

The study addresses the issue of the degree of integration of continuing vocational education in Scottish universities. Integration is defined as where CVE is regarded as a normal departmental activity, in the same way as undergraduate or postgraduate teaching and research. Issues focused upon include both mainstreaming and organisation/management of CVE, both identified as factors determining the degree of integration of CVE.

Universities are moving down the route to greater modularisation, credit accumulation and transfer, part-time degrees and accreditation of prior learning. The opportunities for significant extension of short course programmes linked in with these developments is well recognised and the integration of CVE into mainstream university activities is clearly beginning.

Models for the management of CVE in the universities surveyed were as varied as the number of universities visited. However it was significant that in all cases a central unit with responsibilities for CVE management existed. Hence good practice in management of CVE may not necessarily be synonymous with the devolution of control of CVE to academic departments involved in the activity.

Key Issue 5.1: Organisation for Continuing Vocational Education in British Universities

Professor Chris Duke, Chairman of Continuing Education and Pro-Vice-Chancellor, University of Warwick

Available from:

Professor Chris Duke
Department of Continuing Education
University of Warwick
COVENTRY
CV4 7AL

This paper examines some ways in which universities make organisational arrangements for continuing vocational education (CVE) institution-wide. It touches on the importance of different contexts and assumptions about the 'models' for the management of CVE. It addresses three particular issues:

* specialised central continuing education units
* the evolution of extra-mural liberal adult education into broader-based departments
* industrial liaison offices or units

It concludes:

* that organisation remains problematic
* that no one arrangement will suit each university for all time

* that the management of CVE is and will continue to be substantially affected by other changes in the role and management of universities
* but also that several considerations about the management of CVE apply virtually universally and should not be overlooked in any institution.

Key Issue 5.2: **Internal Organisation: The Management and Motivation of University Staff Employed Outside CVE Departments to Deliver Quality CVE Services**

Chris Ellis, Director OPIT, University of Nottingham.

Available from:

Chris Ellis
Office of Professional and Industrial Training
The University of Nottingham
NOTTINGHAM
NG7 2RD

The report suggests that three important misconceptions should be tackled:

* The perception of CVE as detracting from research and undergraduate teaching. There are counter examples. The real problem is poor management.

* Poor use of CVE development funds by non-CVE specialists who obtained them. There are now a variety of good practice methods involving a measure of payment by results.

* The need to develop accredited CVE, sometimes including accredited experiential learning.

Other issues include obtaining a full and consistent record of institutional CVE activity, improving the quality of the CVE product offered by the weaker of the institution's deliverers (at both departmental and individual level), and the use of new media (eg. distance learning, computer based learning).

Key Issue 6.1: Marketing

Sue Cross, Director of Continuing Education, Department of External Affairs, University College London.

Available from:

Sue Cross
Director of Continuing Education
External Affairs
University College London
Gower Street
LONDON
WC1E 6BT

As universities are asked to articulate their mission and demonstrate their effectiveness, continuing education must be sure of its ground if it is to command a place in the future. This study develops data and ideas on marketing and its relationship to 'sustainability, quality and integration' by looking at key factors on the demand side and how these impact on the university. The role of the Employment Department, Training and Enterprise Councils and professional bodies is considered in some details. In times of economic recession and increasing competition a fragmented market requires that there is more emphasis on identifying customer needs and on aligning supply to meet them.

Key Issue 6.2: Marketing: CVE and the Community

Marie Fleming, Assistant Director, Department of Adult Continuing Education, University College of Swansea

Available from:

Marie Fleming
Department of Adult Continuing Education
University College of Swansea
5th Floor
Science Tower
SWANSEA
SA2 8PP

This report focuses on the results of a survey which looked at issues relating to the Marketing of CVE.

The survey addresses various issues such as:

* Customer Orientation
* Departmental and Staff Development
* Internal and External Partnerships
* The International Role of CVE

The report suggests that even though universities have marketing officers, CVE is not marketed as a central function nor is any market research undertaken.

This lack of customer orientation means that institutions are still concentrating on promoting what they have to offer as opposed to what clients really want or need. The

report considers staff and departmental development and identifies activities which motivate and demotivate both. The paper also examines ways in which Institutions link with external partners and the effect this can have on curriculum, research consultancy and accreditation.

Evidence suggests that the International role of CVE is almost non-existent in many universities, currently things are slowly changing, and most respondents interviewed are making a concerted effort to place the remit of ESF totally within CE Departments.

Key Issue 7: Buildings and Accommodation

Keith Percy, Director of Adult Continuing Education
Alexandra Withnall, Senior Research Officer
Alison Graddon, Research Assistant
Office of Adult Continuing Education, University of Lancaster

Available from:

Dr Keith Percy
Office of Adult Continuing Education
Lancaster University
LANCASTER
LA1 4YL

This report on buildings and capital investment is fundamental to the whole enquiry into good practice in CVE. Some universities have now invested considerable sums of money in purpose built, or purpose adapted, teaching and/or residential accommodation for the provision of CVE – particularly for management development and training. Largely they have taken a considerable risk; they have taken a view that such accommodation will allow them to make the quality provision which they believe the market requires and also that it will increase their market share. Others have not yet taken this direction although, as the investigation in part indicates, some are contemplating the advantages of doing so. The report includes data on both present and planned provision obtained from a postal survey, followed by some selected visits.

APPENDIX 6

CVE PROJECT: LINKS WITH PROJECTS BEING FUNDED BY THE UFC IN 1991/92

The following five projects appear to impinge directly on the proposed work:

1 LIVERPOOL Integrated Graduate Development Schemes

There is now a developing experience on the part of universities and polytechnics, students and their employing firms, of the operation of integrated graduate development programmes. By 1991 it will be possible to mount a serious review of the performance of such programmes seen from all those perspectives and to draw some conclusions about future development and adaptation. This will involve interviewing across a range of participants in a variety of programmes.

2 OXFORD The Funding of Continuing Professional Development (CPD)

The increase in continuing professional development activities on the part of higher education bodies has been significant in recent years. Funding policy demands that these activities be self-financing, other than for development costs. This project will investigate the implications of this policy and the extent to which it encourages or constrains growth in provision.

The aims of the research project will be:

(i) to explore the concept of self-financing in relation to CPD;

(ii) to assess the extent to which existing CPD provision is fully self-financing;

(iii) to develop models for full cost, self-financing CPD;

(iv) to evaluate the feasibility of self-financing CPD in relation to different forms of CPD, the level of provision, the amount of provision, and the market overall.

The project will require a project officer or consultant for one year, to be based in Rewley House, and will be carried out in association with the Kellogg Forum in Continuing Education, which will also contribute £10,000 to the funding of the project.

The Kellogg Forum will be responsible for the project, but investigations will be guided by a steering group comprising representative members of the Universities Council for Adult and Continuing Education.

3 SHEFFIELD The Success or Failure of PICKUP Projects

Initial pump-priming grants have now been available for several years for the development of new vocational short courses. The importance of such courses for UK industry and commerce is clear, but views vary as to the most effective means by which new courses should be established. By looking at the experience of PICKUP projects from various institutions, research will aim to examine the scale and nature of initial support which is most effective and the period required before projects can realistically become self-financing. Reference will be made to levels of institutional support and to variations between different sectors of industry, commerce or the professions. The use of PICKUP funds to support in-house courses for particular clients as well as open courses will also be considered. Finally, the study will look at the extent to which the availability of PICKUP funds has encouraged institutions of higher education to develop courses in subject areas with little or no tradition of Continuing Education. The project will be led by Professor G Chivers (Professor of Continuing Education).

4 WARWICK — Universities Internal Organisational Arrangements for Maintaining the Different Elements of Continuing Education

(Principal Researcher: Professor Chris Duke)

The proposal is for a second year to continue with a project which was supported last year. The researchers will continue to collect data, both nationally of significant trends and locally through single institution case studies, with a view to establishing their significance and identifying patterns. The results will be linked to the 1991 UCACE Conference, which is on precisely this theme.

5 YORK — Development of Monitoring Systems

The monitoring of the quality and quantity of CE is becoming increasingly essential for all departments, both those specifically addressing the adult/liberal education markets and particularly the wide range of academic departments that are rapidly becoming the major providers of vocational CE.

This one year study will help to identify the means by which universities collect short course data, monitor progress and evaluate the outcome in terms of meeting their objectives; the needs of the participants, and the level of academic achievement required by the university itself to ensure that the programmes are consistent with and complementary to the aims of the university for the provision of higher education.

APPENDIX 7

UCACE MEMBERSHIP

The Universities Council for Adult and Continuing Education (UCACE) has a corporate membership of UK universities (plus other co-opted and associate members). There is a differential subscription which allows universities to choose if they wish to have one or two members of Council which allows them, if they wish to have separate representatives for continuing vocational (CVE) and liberal adult (LAE) education, with separate voting rights.

This project was concerned with CVE and with professional networking through UCACE. It is therefore interesting to note which institutions belong to UCACE and which have representatives on Council whose responsibilities are predominantly CVE.

UCACE Membership	SINGLE representative on UCACE Council		TWO representatives on UCACE Council
	Predominantly CVE	Joint CVE/LAE	
Aston	x		
Bath	x		
Birmingham			x
Bradford			x
Bristol			x
Brunel	x		
Cambridge			x
City		x	
Cranfield	x		
Durham		x	
UEA		x	
Essex		x	
Exeter			x
Hull			x
Keele		x	
Kent			x
Lancaster			x
Leeds			x
Leicester			x
Liverpool			x

UCACE Membership	SINGLE representative on UCACE Council		TWO representatives on UCACE Council
	Predominantly CVE	Joint CVE/LAE	
London:			
Birkbeck	.....	 x	
Goldsmiths	.....	.....	 x
Imperial	 x		
Institute of Education	 x		
King's	 x		
LSE	 x		
SOAS	 x		
Loughborough	.....	 x	
Manchester	.....	 x	
Newcastle	.....	.....	 x
Nottingham	.....	.....	 x
Open University	.....	 x	
Oxford	.....	 x	
Reading	.....	 x	
Salford	 x		
Sheffield	.....	.....	 x
Southampton	.....	.....	 x
Surrey	.....	.....	 x
Sussex	.....	.....	 x
Warwick	.....	 x	
York	.....	 x	
UNIVERSITIES OF WALES:			
Aberystwyth	.....	 x	
Bangor	.....	 x	
Cardiff	.....	.....	 x
Swansea	.....	 x	
UNIVERSITIES OF SCOTLAND:			
Aberdeen	.....	 x	
Dundee	.....	.....	 x

UCACE Membership	SINGLE representative on UCACE Council		TWO representatives on UCACE Council
	Predominantly CVE	Joint CVE/LAE	
Edinburgh	.....	 x	
Glasgow	.....	.....	 x
Heriot-Watt	 x		
St Andrews	.....	 x	
Stirling	.....	.....	 x
Strathclyde	.....	 x	
UNIVERSITIES OF NORTHERN IRELAND:			
Belfast	.....	 x	
Ulster	.....	 x	
	11	22	22

Note: The number of 'paid-up' members was correct as at 17-07-92.

APPENDIX 8

LETTER FROM CELIA JONES – Chief Executive, Northamptonshire TEC –TO JOHN BUSHNELL – Department for Education6

7 November 1991

Dear John

UCACE/DES Project: Continuing Vocational Education in Universities

I have been spending some time considering the best type of input that I as a TEC Chief Executive can give to this project as a member of the Steering Group apart from the meetings themselves. I am aware that at the last Steering Group I really didn't say very much as I felt that many of the areas being addressed were not in fact about developing relationships and business with Training and Enterprise Councils.

I have put together some thoughts about this area and the attached paper is intented to give you a feel for working with universities from a TEC perspective. I would emphasise, of course, that my perspective within Northamptonshire may well be different from that of other TECs. However, a pen picture of Northamptonshire might well give you some idea as to how we differ from other TECs.

Northamptonshire is an average size TEC with approximately 40 staff and a budget of £12 million. Approximately £11.5 million of that budget is fairly clearly allocated to programmes, to staff, overheads, etc. However, quite large quantities of even the strictly programme related budgets can be used for different types of development activity. The remaining £500,000 is very much at the discretion of the TEC to develop local innovative work and can be enhanced by contributions from the private sector, to which the Department of Employment, TEED, will at times contribute equal matched funding. The details of all of this can be discussed at any time. After the

initial year of operation, TECs have greater discretion in the use of operating surpluses but still linked to the TEC Aims and Objectives.

We are a TEC with no university actually on our patch but have one HE institution and 2–3,000 Open University students. Attached to this, as Appendix 1, is the section from our Corporate & Business Plans which relates to one aspect of TECs potential work with HE institutions.

I do not distinguish very strongly between universities and the PCFC sector because in my terms as a TEC Chief Executive there is no reality in such a distinction. Appendix 2 to this paper covers in my view all areas of potential TEC/HE institution linkage. It is not meant to be comprehensive. I do not believe that any TEC or HE institution will have run the gamut of all of these areas. It is, however, suggested as a framework for seeing how TEC/HE institution relationships can and could develop over a period of time.

The subject headings and sections can be expanded and the Project Team might like to take this forward with HE institutions themselves?

PICKUP as such is one area where TECs and HE institutions can work together. However, I believe that activities and actions feed in to and from each other and a symbiotic relationship covering all aspects is much more likely to be of benefit than purely a buying and selling one as might be seen in purely PICKUP activities.

I hope that this is of use, please circulate it freely and if I can help in any further development activities please let me know.

Kind regards
Yours sincerely

CELIA JONES, Chief Executive

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE TRAINING AND ENTERPRISE COUNCIL

LINKS WITH HIGHER EDUCATION AND PLANS TO MEET HIGH LEVEL SKILL NEEDS

1.1 Market Assessment of HE Vocational Provision

The County has one HE provider only, at present, that is Nene College with whom the Council has very close links through a number of activities, eg. Memberships of both Boards, Project Links, Partnership Links, etc. Nene College has close links with Leicester University. Leicester Polytechnics is attempting to broaden its base of influence around the County as well.

The TEC has established links with neighbouring universities including the Departments of Continuing (Vocational) Education at Warwick and Oxford through their Directors. Contacts also exist with Oxford Polytechnic and Westminster HE College in Oxford. Slightly further afield contacts exist with Nottingham University and Polytechnic. No contact has at present been made with either Birmingham or Cambridge Universities but, if required at any time such contact will be made. The TEC also has a good knowledge of the level and type of provision that these universities and polytechnics can provide.

The Open University campus is only ten miles across the Border and in addition its Eastern Region advises us that they have over 2000 students within the County although it is not known how many of these would be following vocational courses.

Management Development provision is available from Sunley Management Centre, part of Nene College which is leading the Management Charter Initiative in the County and from the private providers noted in the LMA previously. It is also available from the

Open University and Open College at lower levels. At the highest level two out of the four premier business schools in the UK are within 15 miles of the County boundary and links are being established with both of these.

Access provision is a feature of FE work in the County and it has direct linkages into the HE system. In addition the CNAA Credit Accumulation and Transfer Scheme (CATS) is also attracting interest from a wide variety of institutions relatively locally.

1.2 Market Assessment of Higher Level Skill Needs

Management Development needs are widespread and being at least partially met as shown by the LMA. However such a market assessment cannot easily distinguish significant levels of skill shortage at the highest levels because of the small numbers likely to be involved and also the very specialist nature of some of the needs. Hence to determine the actual needs of industry at the highest levels and whether or not the TEC can/should be assisting will require further market investigation, the use of the Development groups' and Local Advisory Boards' experience, collaboration with professional institutes and of course individual firms themselves.

It is also likely that some needs will not be localised and partnerships beyond the County and even the UK may be necessary to establish the requirements and how they can be met.

2. Strategic Planning and HE

2.1 Partnership

This will be the overarching theme for any activities with HE. In the first instance it is intended to extend partnership arrangements such as that already established with Nene College and industry into other fields. It would also be the TECs intention to become party to some of the COMETT UETP arrangements should they coincide with the County's high level training needs.

2.2 Market Assessment

Work will be necessary to further determine local higher level skill needs. Some of this can be done by desk research and extrapolation of national trends but some field activity may also be necessary. Economies of scale may be achievable by working with other TECs, professional institutions, single employers, employers' groups and providers of vocational HE.

2.3 Development of Provision

Having very recently received the HTNT documentation from TEED it will be our intention to work with Nene College and/or other near providers to develop appropriate bid(s). This will build on the work already done in this field. There may also be the opportunity of economies of scale in joint sponsorship of courses with the groups noted in 2.2 above.

2.4 Relevance of HE to Employment

There is no EHE programme in Northamptonshire but we will be seeking ways in which students can become more oriented towards the world of employment. there are a number of avenues to be explored and developed. For example we are supporting the TVEI interest in furthering the use of Records of Achievement in HE. Credit Accumulation and Transfer (CATS) is another area for potential support at a minimum by increasing awareness of its aims and objective together with other interested parties. Finally, even if the formal Enterprise in Higher Education programme is not available at present to County institutions, initiatives such as Pegasus (the development of transferable skills for HE students) can be promoted.

2.5 Value for Money and Local Relevance

In many cases the application of quite small sums of money can produce significant leverage within HE and hence good value for money can be achieved. However wer must be certain that the work being done, whether it be market assessment, the development of provison, awareness raising or other activity has a relevance to the

economic well-being of the County and employment within the County. Only in special circumstances eg. where the County is a national/international leader as in footwear technology or in partnership with outside bodies could we consider work, primarily for the regional, national or international good.

POTENTIAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TECS AND HE INSTITUTIONS

Celia Jones, Chief Executive, Northamptonshire Training and Enterprise Council

1. FUNDED PROGRAMMES

1.1 TEED Centrally Funded Programmes

- Enterprise in HE
- Higher Technology National Training
- Accrediting Work Based Learning in HE
- Anything else?

All these programmes are centrally funded but do have a local basis and can be used to develop the local remits of HE institutions and to further TEC aims as well.

1.2 National Development Work

Projects are now underway in the 1991/92 cycle and a new prospectus is to be published in December. Potential areas for work in 1991/92 included:

- Training the Trainer
- Quality Assurance
- Management Charter Initiative
- etc.

For next year this will also include Investors in People and some other activities.

1.3 European Funding

Working together, meeting joint "aims" about

i) the economic well-being of the local community, eg. European Social Fund and

ii) the development of pan-European commitment and development through partnership, eg. FORCE, COMETT, TEMPUS, etc.

1.4 Other Public Sector Funding

From other government departments eg. Home Office (old Section 11).

2.0 Relationship with Bachelor of Education and Industrial Placements for B.Ed Students and Others

A number of TECs are providing placements themselves for business study students and are also assisting with programmes of increasing industrial awareness for teachers in training.

3.0 Research

3.1 Labour Market Research (LMI)

- General
- Sectoral
- Special Interest Groups

3.2 Part of TEC's own R and D programmes, eg. in areas of Higher Level Skills and/or Management Development

3.3 General economic and employment research, eg. in growth of smaller business sectors

3.4 Part of HE institutions' own research and development programmes coinciding with TEC aims and objectives

4.0 Consultancy

- Process and/or Management consultancy to the TEC itself
- Management consultancy to employers utilising TEC funding to employers, eg. through business development funding and/or DTI programmes
- Project management for TECs' own developments and/or co-ordinated programmes

5.0 Providers of Training

- TEC programmes, eg. Business Skills Seminars
- Management development
- Pilots for higher level skills
- Training the trainer

6.0 Co-ordination, Networking, Advice

- Co-ordinating inter-TEC activities on a Regional basis for higher level skills training
- Potential for acting as intermediary between TECs and professional bodies
- Advising, monitoring TECs, eg. Business Ethics
- Participation in TEC activities not immediately financially beneficial to the HE institutions, eg. participation in Sub-Boards/Groups and/or Main Board

7.0 Reciprocal use of Premises

8.0 Sponsoring jointly with TECs programmes of Training, eg. using university name and TEC name to give increased credibility and status to programmes

9.0 Evaluators of TEC activities and Programmes etc. Quality/Quantity

APPENDIX 9

CONTINUING EDUCATION RECORD (CER), 1990/91

Table of full-time equivalent (FTE) student numbers (@ 300 contact hours per FTE) by aim of course

University	Aim of Course			All courses
	Liberal Adult Education Codes 4 & 5	INSET Code 1	Continuing Vocational Education Codes 2 & 3	
Aston	33	–	126	159
Bath	96	21	170	287
Birmingham	1008	31	870	1909
Bradford	70	3	545	619
Bristol	573	52	638	1262
Brunel	61	24	243	327
Cambridge	873	–	121	994
City	676	–	180	857
Durham	995	84	217	1296
UEA	203	1	178	383
Essex	138	24	141	303
Exeter	692	243	135	1069
Hull	837	16	225	1078
Keele	676	67	108	852
Kent	483	3	67	552
Lancaster	160	94	398	652
Leeds	1061	247	420	1728
Leicester	646	587	65	1298
Liverpool	564	25	79	668
London Business	–	–	207	207
London	5229	335	1222	6786
Loughborough	27	28	443	498
Manchester Business	15	–	475	490
Manchester	930	111	840	1881
UMIST	32	2	327	361

University	Aim of Course			All courses
	Liberal Adult Education Codes 4 & 5	INSET Code 1	Continuing Vocational Education Codes 2 & 3	
Newcastle	481	113	365	959
Nottingham	1119	126	227	1473
Oxford	565	53	353	971
Reading	259	100	568	927
Salford	151	6	83	241
Sheffield	761	14	274	1048
Southampton	442	51	372	865
Surrey	954	23	630	1607
Sussex	511	143	68	722
Warwick	652	118	502	1272
York	114	97	136	347
ENGLAND	22087	2843	12018	36948
Aberystwyth	591	80	66	736
Bangor	616	1	81	698
Cardiff	693	2	398	1092
Lampeter	87	–	109	196
Swansea	587	25	304	916
Welsh Med	56	–	35	90
WALES	2629	108	993	3730
ENGLAND & WALES	24716	2951	13011	40678
Aberdeen	408	12	100	520
Dundee	606	14	237	856
Edinburgh	949	12	426	1387
Glasgow	962	4	528	1494
Heriot-Watt	1	3	220	223
St Andrews	626	–	128	754

University	Aim of Course			All courses
	Liberal Adult Education Codes 4 & 5	INSET Code 1	Continuing Vocational Education Codes 2 & 3	
Stirling	340	59	481	880
Strathclyde	199	9	712	920
SCOTLAND	4090	113	2831	7033
GRT BRITAIN	28806	3063	15842	47711
Belfast	940	87	286	1312
Ulster	1249	-	340	1589
N IRELAND	2188	87	626	2902
UNITED KINGDOM	30994	3150	16468	50613
YEAR 1989/90 TOTAL	27318	4412	16609	48339

Note: The above data excludes courses organised by postgraduate medical departments.

Source: Universities Statistical Record.

APPENDIX 10

FORM 3 - 1990-1991 INCOME
VOCATIONAL & OTHER CONTINUING EDUCATION COURSES

		INSET Courses Head 3a/b	INSET Courses Head 3c	Updating Courses - Head 3c "Closed" UK Studnts	"Closed" OS Studnts	"Open" UK Studnts	"Open" OS Studnts	Total Updating	Courses for the Unemployed	Non-Updating Courses
1	Aston	--	--	257504	404258	131426	--	793188	--	209034
2	Bath	--	33987	126258	348	133511	8978	269095	14631	189913
3	Birmingham	--	97238	616120	1201809	1604273	--	3422202	--	915
4	Bradford	--	7000	666863	639694	626624	815717	2748898	45000	4000
5	Bristol	755623	--	301234	--	--	--	301234	--	730856
6	Brunel	--	67179	745274	--	134832	--	880106	--	25499
7	Cambridge	--	--	132231	9300	310902	124495	576928	--	1414655
8	City	--	--	354073	--	1170747	123155	1647975	46539	407964
9	Durham	--	--	78926	--	4121	--	83047	6263	32838
10	E. Anglia	27270	46300	92412	--	44505	299923	436840	--	--
11	Essex	--	115130	77318	88921	200806	83299	450344	--	418059
12	Exeter	383385	209913	36361	--	545944	--	582305	--	--
13	Hull	--	12519	32054	88791	194982	37935	353762	--	45098
14	Keele	--	--	34538	--	5064	--	39602	--	217357
15	Kent	--	--	--	--	160115	--	160115	--	--
16	Lancaster	--	--	50320	--	207321	--	257641	--	--
17	Leeds	495000	260000	466000	111000	893000	--	1470000	5000	239000
18	Leicester	--	350080	12400	--	226999	--	239399	--	--
19	Liverpool	129566	--	68880	--	244262	--	313142	--	--
20	L. Bus. Sch	--	--	18130	31754	2288080	865804	3203768	--	--
21	London	1847543	233417	185392	420553	1998063	1028264	3632272	--	1808505
22	Loughboro'	--	30943	686425	86419	892729	62992	1728565	--	467431
23	M. Bus. Sch	--	--	1117602	313969	1368454	351757	3151782	--	--
24	Manchester	--	117039	--	--	2619255	754466	3373721	--	--
25	UMIST	--	8338	63190	--	329215	11418	403823	--	--
26	Newcastle	123290	--	122323	--	525070	58051	705444	--	--
27	Nottingham	736818	125485	131321	520978	625347	96076	1373722	--	181442
28	Oxford	--	--	73778	--	--	50000	123778	--	633203
29	Reading	--	95409	247687	46160	1127906	19898	1441651	--	162871
30	Salford	--	12320	125205	--	218227	--	343432	9200	--
31	Sheffield	--	--	--	--	1941193	--	1941193	--	--
32	Southampton	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
33	Surrey	--	9578	341326	41931	510245	612839	1506341	1100	227446
34	Sussex	--	152584	63700	8279	64215	--	136194	--	122741
35	Warwick	58291	25000	1196483	--	1715635	--	2912118	--	1731954
36	York	55833	85502	87288	54199	374144	51332	566963	9016	79174
37	ENGLAND	4612619	2094961	8608616	4068363	23437212	5456399	41570590	136749	9349955
38	Aberystwyth	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
39	Bangor	--	--	28018	--	1936	--	29954	600	93855
40	UWC Cardiff	--	60853	56373	78676	771419	245786	1152254	--	168116
41	Lampeter	--	--	6945	13985	3519	--	24449	80657	5524
42	Swansea	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
43	U.W.Col.Med	--	--	--	--	29882	--	29882	--	21348
44	W. Registry	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
45	WALES	--	60853	91336	92661	806756	245786	1236539	81257	288843
46	ENG & WALES	4612619	2155814	8699952	4161024	24243968	5702185	42807129	218006	9638798
47	Aberdeen	76135	6030	117446	--	96776	--	214222	--	140759
48	Dundee	--	116	55344	--	306582	6422	368348	--	443165
49	Edinburgh	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2577655
50	Glasgow	--	--	--	--	90168	--	90168	3843	205849
51	Heriot-Watt	--	--	110942	121436	370065	--	602443	--	--
52	St. Andrews	--	--	--	--	33252	--	33252	--	134881
53	Stirling	--	--	37726	--	787216	68668	893610	529031	--
54	Strathclyde	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
55	SCOTLAND	76135	6146	321458	121436	1684059	75090	2202043	532874	3502309
56	GT BRITAIN	4688754	2161960	9021410	4282460	25928027	5777275	45009172	750880	13141107
57	Belfast	69138	31241	129095	--	104307	--	233402	--	425694
58	Ulster	--	--	68277	--	1055422	--	1123699	308504	70505
59	N.IRELAND	69138	31241	197372	--	1159729	--	1357101	308504	496199
60	U.K. TOTAL	4757892	2193201	9218782	4282460	27087756	5777275	46366273	1059384	13637306

Source: Universities Statistical Record